

Public comments received by email or in writing by the Community Development Director prior to 5:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting were welcome on any topic. Public comments or testimony were also allowed during the electronic meeting using the Zoom Meeting ID and Access Code that was posted on the Village's website at least 2 hours before the meeting. The meeting and public hearing was conducted electronically via Zoom and broadcast live via Riverside TV due to the ongoing public health emergency, and based on the authority provided by Executive Order 2020-07, issued by Governor Pritzker on March 16, 2020, as most recently extended by Executive Order 2020-33, dated April 30, 2020, and Executive Order 2020-32, issued by Governor Pritzker on April 30, 2020, limiting public gatherings and suspending the Open Meetings Act physical presence requirement.



VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
Minutes

I. Call to Order: The Regular Meeting of the Village of Riverside Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 27, 2020, electronically via Zoom. Chairperson Mateo called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call: *Present:* Chairperson Mateo
 Commissioner Heneghan
 Commissioner Marhoul
 Commissioner May
 Commissioner Mathews
 Commissioner Miller
 Commissioner Pelletier

Also Present: Village Attorney Marrs
 Community Development Director Abt

Also on the Meeting: Mgmt. Analyst Bouman
 Petitioners Shelley & Bart Richards

III. Approval of Minutes:
A. Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting and Public Hearing minutes of March 11, 2020
Commissioner **Pelletier made a motion** to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting and Public hearing of March 11, 2020. Commissioner **Mathews seconded** the motion.
AYES: Pelletier, Mathews, Marhoul, May, Miller, Heneghan, Mateo.
NAYS: None.
Motion passed.

- B. Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting and Public Hearing minutes of February 26, 2020
Commissioner **Marhoul made a motion** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting and Public hearing of February 26, 2020. Commissioner **Miller seconded** the motion.
AYES: Pelletier, Mathews, Marhoul, May, Miller, Heneghan, Mateo.
NAYS: None.
Motion passed.

IV. Visitors, Petitions, Citizen Requests, and Communications:

There was none.

V. Liaison Report:

- A. Village Board Update
Trustee Pollock was not in attendance. Chairperson Mateo asked Director Abt if there was any update. Director Abt noted that the Board approved the Special Use and Variations for Ames School.

VI. Public Hearings and Recommendations:

- A. PZ20-001 – 711 & 715 Arlington Road – Request for Variation from the Fence and Wall Location street yard requirement to build a 4 ft. aluminum fence that encroaches approximately 12.5 ft. into the required street yard from Lindberg Road.
1. PUBLIC HEARING to consider an application for a variation from Section 10-7-3(F)2(a) (Fence and Wall Location in Residential Districts) of the Village of Riverside Zoning Ordinance to allow a 4-ft aluminum fence in the street yard in the R1-A Single-Family Residence District. Petitioners: Shelly & Bart Richards.

*Chairperson Mateo opened the public hearing and entered the public notice into the record as **Exhibit A**.*

Chairperson Mateo swore in the Petitioners.

Director Abt gave a brief outline of the variation request. She explained that the Zoning Ordinance prohibits fences in the street yards. Therefore, a variation is necessary for the proposed fence. The proposed fence is a 4 foot aluminum fence and would encroach 12.5 feet into the Petitioners' required street yard from Lindberg. Director Abt explained that the property is comprised of two parcels. The house is located on the southern parcel. The owners purchased the northern parcel after the home was built. This purchase has created a new zoning lot. This new zoning lot is a corner lot. A corner lot is a lot that has two intersecting street yards. The street yard is determined by where the house is located. Since this is a corner lot it has two street yards, one from Arlington and one from Lindberg. A street yard is considered the open space between the closest point of the principal building to any portion of a property line that abuts a street. In this case for the Petitioners to install a fence it would need to start at the rear (northwest) corner of their house and extend straight back to their rear (west) property line. Alternately they could connect the southern edge of

the garage to the house and enclose the portion of their rear yard south of the driveway. To bring the fence any closer to Lindberg than the house is, a variance is necessary. She also explained that considering the 711 Arlington property individually does not help either, because accessory structures cannot be built on a lot without a principal structure. The proposed fence will be approximately 45 feet from the north property line along Lindberg. If the variation is approved, a building permit for the fence could be issued.

The Petitioners, Shelley and Bart Richards, explained that they want to enclose their back yard and doing that is not really feasible without the variance. They noted they will be encroaching 12 ½ feet into the street yard, but the majority of that is their driveway. The fence will be about 1 ¾ feet north of the driveway and they plan on landscaping along the fence.

Chairperson Mateo asked if the Commissioners had any questions of Staff or the Petitioners.

Chairperson Mateo asked if the Petitioners had considered an invisible fence. The Petitioners stated they had a small dog and there are coyotes in the area; they want to not only keep the dog in but also to protect it by keeping coyotes out.

Commissioner Marhoul asked why the garage did not define the setback from Lindberg. Staff noted that the Zoning Code is written such that it is the principal structure that determines the setbacks, not accessory structures. Since the garage is detached it is an accessory structure.

Commissioner Mathews questioned whether the size of encroachment was 12.5 feet or 2 feet? Staff stated the encroachment into the required street yard is 12.5 feet, however the fence would be located only 2 feet further north than the driveway which is located along the northern property line of the southern parcel (715 Arlington). Therefore the fence would only be encroaching 2 feet or so onto the northern parcel (711 Arlington). Commissioner Miller noted that the driveway is also encroaching however that is considered an allowed encroachment.

Commissioners also had questions about the implications of building something on the second parcel if that parcel is sold off separately in the future and whether that lot was a buildable lot. Director Abt noted that as the lot meets the minimum frontage requirement, it is a buildable lot and that the Zoning Code prohibits creating a new nonconformity with the division or sale of a parcel. Therefore the fence would need to be removed.

The Commissioners asked if any consideration was given to placing the fence along the driveway so that it was on the 715 Arlington parcel. The Petitioners stated that they had considered it however given the narrowness of the driveway with young drivers they wanted to avoid issues with the fence and provide additional space. Chairperson Mateo noted that narrow driveways are fairly typical in Riverside. Director Abt said that considering the 715 Arlington

property independently they could install the fence on their property line however doing so would preclude them from making any further improvements on the 711 Arlington Road property. Either they need to be looked at as one property or two independent properties. Commissioner Miller asked if there was any idea how many corner lots in town are more than one lot of record. How many other corner lots would have this option to consider either being one lot or two? Director Abt stated she was not aware of any other lots like this in town where there is a separate buildable lot that is on the corner like this one. Commissioner Marhoul asked if anything were to be built on that northern parcel property would it need a variance. Director Abt noted there were a few things that are allowed to be built in street yards, such as walkways, driveways and patios, however anything that is above grade, such as a deck or pool or shed would require a variance.

The Petitioners provided the PZC with some background on the property. Their understanding was that before their house was built there was a ranch home that was centered on the property. A developer bought the property and tore down the house and turned it into two lots. They are unsure if it was two lots at that time or if the developer subdivided the lot. They purchased the new house that was built on the 715 Arlington property. The lot to the north was intended to have a house built on it, however the developer was unable to sell that lot and approached them about purchasing it. They did and have invested in landscaping it to make it a nice part of their property. The Petitioners noted that the practical difficulty or hardship they are experiencing is that the entire northern parcel is considered part of the required street yard which really limits what they can do in trying to locate a fence on their property. They also stated they have no intention of selling the adjacent property.

Commissioner Miller asked if the fence could be connected to the house at a different point closer to the garage to provide more room. The Petitioners were unsure if that was feasible due to the stairs and also noted that would shorten the area the cars have to turn to move past the house.

Chairperson Mateo verified that there was no guests on the Zoom call that wished to speak.

*Chairperson Mateo stated that they had received several comments via email on this petition which were included in the packet and Director Abt noted one had been received that evening. The comments were read for the Commission and were entered into the record as **Exhibit B**.*

Several of the comments received from neighbors were in favor of the variation request and did not feel it would have a negative impact on the neighborhood. One comment was not in favor of the request. That commenter expressed concern about the loss of open space and view and potential precedent the granting of the variation would set for adding fences to the neighborhood.

There were no additional comments.

Commissioner **Marhoul** made a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner **Mathews seconded** the motion. Voice vote. All Ayes. Motion passes.

The public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

2. DISCUSSION, MOTION AND RECOMMENDATION by the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Village Board regarding the request for variation set forth in 6.A.1 above.

The Commissioners discussed the standards and that the larger zoning lot with the structure built entirely on only one parcel and the fact that the two parcels together created a corner lot created a unique situation and a practical difficulty in the application of the code. It was noted by Commissioner Mathews that this was an extraordinary physical condition peculiar to this property. It was also noted by Commissioners that the proposed location of the fence shows an intention to meet the intent of the code, which is to leave street yards open. The new fence will be setback 45 feet from the property line still leaving a large open street yard. Commissioner Miller was not convinced this was that unique of a situation as there are many lots, including corner lots, which are comprised of more than one parcel. She believed this was more a failing of the code than a unique situation. She believed this was a reasonable request however looking at the standards, she could not vote in favor of the variation. She suggested that perhaps this is a situation where the code needed to be amended. Perhaps the Village needs to reevaluate what is allowed to encroach into the street yard. The Commissioners determined that the variation will not result in a financial gain to the Petitioners. There was a consensus among the Commissioners that the proposed fence would not have a detrimental impact on other properties and that given the height of the fence and its large setback from the lot line, it will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The Commissioners did not believe the fence would impair an adequate supply of light or air to the adjacent properties nor would it increase the danger of fire to adjacent properties or create any drainage problems.

Commissioner **Pelletier made a motion** to recommend approval of the variation from Section 10-7-3(F)2(a) (Fence and Wall Location in Residential Districts) to allow a fence to be constructed that encroaches 12.5 feet into the required street yard (Lindberg) on the Property located at 711-715 Arlington Road. Commissioner **Marhoul seconded** the motion.

AYES: Pelletier, Mathews, Marhoul, May, Heneghan, Mateo.

NAYS: Miller

Motion passed.

Director Abt stated she would notify the petitioners when this would appear on a Village Board agenda.

The Petitioners thanked the Commission for their thoughtful consideration.

1. PUBLIC HEARING to consider an application from the Village of Riverside for text amendments to the Village of Riverside Zoning Ordinance regarding Planned Unit Developments. Petitioner: Village of Riverside.

*Chairperson Mateo opened the public hearing and entered the public notice into the record as **Exhibit C**.*

Director Abt explained that in 2019 they began to look at comparable communities that have experienced redevelopment investment in their downtowns and other commercial areas to review the zoning tools they are utilizing and how their zoning regulations compare to the Village. These communities include: Brookfield, River Forest, LaGrange, LaGrange Park, Western Springs, Clarendon Hills and Hinsdale. Some of the zoning regulations these other communities utilize include PUDs and denser bulk regulations such as maximum building heights up to six (6) stories. This information was presented to the Village Board. The Village Board was in favor of exploring the idea of PUDs. They asked the PZC to look into this further and provide recommendations on locations in the Village where PUDs might be appropriate.

Director Abt summarized the Commission's discussion on PUDs over the past several months, including a draft PUD Ordinance prepared by the Village Attorney as a framework for facilitating further discussion and direction about the possible use of PUDs in Riverside. After discussion and review of the draft ordinance and other communities' PUD Ordinances, the Commission recommended allowing PUDs in the Village and recommended to the Village Board moving forward with the draft ordinance. Director Abt shared that at their March 5, 2020 meeting, the Village Board directed Staff and the PZC to move forward with a public hearing on the Proposed Text Amendments.

Director Abt explained that PUDs are a zoning tool intended to encourage and allow more creative and flexible development of land that results in better development and design than might otherwise be accomplished under the strict application of the Zoning Code. They are typically allowed where the development provides for compensating amenities to the Village such as additional open space, aesthetic amenities which will enhance the character of the site and facilitating the implementation of adopted Village land use policies.

She explained that the Proposed Text Amendments include the following changes which have incorporated the commission's recommendations from previous discussions:

- Adds "Planned Unit Developments" to the Use Table for the Residential and Business Zoning Districts. It designates them as Special Uses.
- Creates a new Chapter 10-13 "Planned Unit Developments" that creates the procedures and requirements for PUDs to allow flexibility in the application of the standards of this zoning ordinance based upon procedural protections providing for detailed review of individual significant proposals that are in the public interest and provide a public benefit.
- References the new PUD process in the Administration Chapter under Special Uses.

- Precludes single family residences from being eligible for PUDs,
- No minimum size requirement for a PUD.
- The PUD is subject to the underlying district regulations unless an exception is specifically granted. Exceptions from district regulations may only be granted, if the village board finds that such exceptions meet certain requirements/qualifications such as provide a public benefit, promotes the objectives of the village, enhances the quality of the design, etc.
- Lists preferred design characteristics and amenities as guidance.

Director Abt further explained that PUDs are considered a type of Special Use and are therefore approved by the Village Board after a public hearing and comprehensive review by the PZC. Steps include:

- Pre application meeting(s)
- Optional concept plan consultation with PZC/Village Board
- Preliminary Plan approval – requires a public hearing before PZC including notification of surrounding property owners. The Commission will make a formal recommendation to the Village Board. The Village Board shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the special use for a planned unit development.
- Final Plan approval – applicant must submit a Final Plan within one year of approval of the Preliminary Plan. The Zoning Administrator will review for conformance with the Preliminary Plan. If it is in substantial compliance with the preliminary plan the zoning administrator will forward to the Village Board for approval. The Ordinance and Final Plan will be recorded with the Cook County Recorder of Deeds.
- Any major changes to the Final Plan will require a public hearing by the PZC and Village Board approval. The Village Board may also decide that the request for a major change is so significant that it must be considered a new PUD application and should be resubmitted as such.
- The Final Plan governs all construction/modifications to the property.

Chairperson Mateo verified that there was no guests on the Zoom call that wished to speak.

Commissioner Miller asked Attorney Marrs about the use of the term “substantial compliance” and whether it needed to be defined. She noted this was as it relates to the Zoning Administrators review of the Final Plan. Her concern was what if the applicant does not agree with the Zoning Administrator’s determination. Attorney Marrs noted that it may be defined by case law, but he would be hesitant to try to define that any more. There are a lot of details with a final plan, that ultimately it really is more of a common sense kind of determination. He also clarified that based on some feedback received from a local developer on the draft text, there were some areas that could use some clean up including the approval of the Final Plan. He noted that part of the process is for the Zoning Administrator to review the Final Plan for conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan. The Zoning Administrator then makes a determination, “is the plan in substantial compliance with the approved Preliminary Plan”. Then they certify that to the Board. The proposed ordinance

only talks about the Board approving the plan. It was noted that it does not address any denial option. Attorney Marrs envisioned there being a scenario where the Board disagreed with the Zoning Administrator's determination and thought that a subparagraph should be added with the option for the Board to disagree and find that the plan is not in substantial conformance with the Preliminary Plan and deny a Final Plan. This would give the developer the opportunity then to take the matter up to a circuit court.

Director Abt also noted that there is a list of major changes in the ordinance in regards to "Final Plans". This can provide some guidance as well into what would be considered "not in substantial compliance". It talks about changes in gross floor area, number of dwelling units, building height. She outlined some scenarios that would be a substantial change and those that would not be.

Chairperson Mateo noted that she had sent the a copy of the draft ordinance from their February meeting to a local developer for some feedback back before the Village Board had given their directive to move forward with a public hearing and before the public notice had been sent which is why it was not included in the packet. She stated she would mention any of those comments as they reviewed those sections of the proposed amendment.

The Commission began going through the proposed ordinance page by page. Chairperson Mateo asked about what plans or policies of the Village the code would be referencing and would it just be the CMAP Plan. Director Abt agreed that would be the only plan currently. Commissioner Henghan had a question about the optional concept plan consultation. Is this something where the developer would come and present to the Commission and they could ask questions of the developer or would it be Staff presenting a proposal to the Commission. Attorney Marrs said the idea would be for the developer to be presenting so they can get direct feedback from the Boards and Commissions that will be reviewing the project. It doesn't require it but it is to their benefit to attend and present themselves. She expressed some concern about that happening outside the public hearing process. Attorney Marrs stated it was similar to what some other communities do where they have a meeting to set a public hearing where an applicant gives a quick overview of the project before the public hearing is set. The idea is to provide an opportunity to make sure everybody is comfortable before the developer invests a lot of money and time in creating the plans and studies needed to apply. Chairperson Mateo noted that it was still part of a public meeting and would be posted on an agenda and would allow for public comment. Attorney Marrs agreed stating it was not a private meeting with the Commission. Commissioner Miller stated it seemed similar to what they did with the Ames School project.

Chairperson Mateo asked about the requirement to show the improvements within 300 ft. of the subject property. She had received a comment that this seemed excessive. She noted she had looked at other codes and there were some that did not have this requirement and others that required more and some that required less. Director Abt stated that if the Commission wants to be consistent, the requirements for a rezoning state a site plan showing all

properties and rights-of-way within 250 ft. of the subject property be submitted. She suggested they could change the 300 ft. requirement to 250 ft. if they wanted to be consistent. Commissioner Heneghan stated she thought 250 ft. was adequate and favored being consistent. Commissioner Marhoul stated that he thought a PUD has a larger impact than a simple variation and was in favor of keeping 300 ft. The remainder of the Commissioners did not feel strongly one way or the other and decided to keep it at 300 ft.

Chairperson Mateo also had some questions about the term “qualified professional” and who that means for various plans for the Preliminary Plan review. Would it be the architect? Attorney Marris and Director Abt noted that certain things such as a traffic study or drainage plan should be prepared by engineers not architects. She also asked about the timing for resubmittals. She asked if 30 days was sufficient time to get on an agenda. The Commission discussed and determined that 60 days would be more appropriate.

Chairperson Mateo questioned subsection “d” of Preliminary Plan procedures where it states that if the application is not acted upon by the Village Board within 60 days of receiving the findings of fact and recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission, the application shall be deemed to have been denied. She noted that this language is not found anywhere else in the Village’s code. She asked why that is there. Attorney Marris stated that it is there to give an applicant conclusion and keep things moving along. He noted that it could be argued that a developer deserves a reason for a denial. He stated he would be ok with removing that language and just say that the Board must act within 60 days and provide written reasons for the denial. Commissioner Miller asked what would happen if a pandemic happened again and the Board couldn’t act within 60 days. Attorney Marris noted that this did happen recently in other communities he works with and the developers were willing to work with the Villages to postpone hearings or meetings given the circumstances and health risks. He also noted that several communities declared local emergencies and in doing that the mayors typically suspend these types of deadlines due to the emergency. He noted that courts likewise understand that municipalities are doing the best they can under the circumstances. The Commissioners had no issue with changing the language to require the Board to take action and felt it was both fair and consistent with existing zoning procedural language.

Attorney Marris asked the Commissioners if the denial of the Final Plan should be added as a new subsection or combined with the approval section. The Commission was fine with either option but agreed it should be added. Director Abt stated she thought it would be better to have it separated.

There were no further comments by the Commission and no guests that wished to speak.

The public comment portion of the hearing was closed.

2. DISCUSSION, MOTION AND RECOMMENDATION by Planning and Zoning Commission to the Village Board regarding the request for a variation set forth in

6.B.1 above.

The Commissioners discussed the text amendment standards. The Commissioners agreed the amendment would promote the general welfare of the Village and that it was consistent with the CMAP CBD Plan. The Commissioners also found that the amendments were consistent with the intent and general regulations of the zoning ordinance and are consistent with the overall structure of the Zoning Ordinance. They also reflect a policy directive of the Village Board. The Commissioners also noted that the text amendment would benefit the residents of the Village as a whole as it would apply Village wide.

Commissioner **Pelletier made a motion** to recommend approval of proposed text amendments to add a new Chapter 13 (Planned Unit Developments) to Title 10 of the Zoning Ordinance with the revisions discussed by the Commission and adding PUDs as Special Uses in Sections 10-4-5 (Use and Bulk Requirement Tables) Table 2: Residential District Permitted Uses and 10-5-9 (Use and Bulk Requirement Tables) Table 4: Business Districts Permitted Uses and to add a reference to the Planned Unit Development Procedures in Section 10-2-2-3(B) Special Uses. Commissioner **Miller seconded** the motion.

AYES: Pelletier, Mathews, Marhoul, May, Miller, Heneghan, Mateo.

NAYS: None.

Motion passed.

VII. Old Business:

VIII. New Business:

IX. Information:

Chairperson Mateo asked about the RTA grant. Director Abt shared that they had put out the RFQ back in late 2019 however they received no proposals. Since then they reposted the RFQ and actually received seven respondents this time. It is supposed to be on the June agenda of the RTA Board to select the consultant. Hopefully once the contract is signed we will hear from RTA what the next steps will be.

X. Adjournment

Chairperson Mateo asked for a motion and second to adjourn the Meeting. Commissioner **May made a motion** to adjourn. Commissioner **Miller seconded**.

AYES: Pelletier, Mathews, Marhoul, May, Miller, Heneghan, Mateo.

NAYES: None.

Motion passed.

Chairperson Mateo declared the meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Community Development Director Abt

Date Approved

**VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE, ILLINOIS
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

Notice is hereby given to all interested persons that a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Riverside will be held on Wednesday, May 27, 2020 at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the business of the Planning and Zoning Commission may permit, to consider an application for a variation from Section 10-7-3(F)2(a) (Fence and Wall Location in Residential Districts) of the Village of Riverside Zoning Ordinance to allow a 4-ft aluminum fence in the street yard in the R1-A Single-Family Residence District.

Due to the ongoing public health emergency, and based on the authority provided by Executive Order 2020-07, issued by Governor Pritzker on March 16, 2020, as most recently extended by Executive Order 2020-33, dated April 30, 2020, and in accordance with Executive Order 2020-32 issued by Governor Pritzker on April 30, limiting public gatherings and suspending the Open Meetings Act physical presence requirement, this meeting will be conducted electronically. It will be streamed live via Zoom and on Riverside Television, where it will be available on YouTube's Riverside TV channel. The Zoom Meeting ID and access code will be made available on the Village's website prior to the hearing. Video of the public hearing will subsequently be posted and made available to the public on the Village website.

Application No.: PZ20-001

Petitioners: Shelly & Bart Richards

Property commonly known as: 711 and 715 Arlington Road

PINs: 15-25-416-029-0000, 15-25-416-030-0000

The variation is sought from the following Section of the Riverside Zoning Ordinance:

Section 10-7-3(F)2(a) (Fence and Wall Location in Residential Districts), which states that fences and walls shall be prohibited in street yards, except where the street yard adjoins a nonresidential use or along 26th Street, 31st Street or York Road, subject to further review by village staff.

The Petitioners seek this variation to build a 4 ft. aluminum fence that encroaches approximately 12.5 ft. into the required street yard from Lindberg Road.

Copies of the variation application are available for inspection at the office of the Village Clerk, 27 Riverside Road, Riverside, Illinois 60546. Copies may also be obtained by emailing the Village's Community Development Director Sonya Abt at sabt@riverside.il.us or by telephone at 708-447-1241 ext. 238, or the Village Clerk at 708-447-2700 at any time prior to the meeting.

Public comments are welcome on the proposed variation that is the subject of the Public Hearing when received by email or in writing by the Village Clerk prior to 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Emailed comments may be sent to Community Development Director Sonya Abt at sabt@riverside.il.us. Written comments may be submitted via U.S. mail or in the dropbox outside of Township Hall to the attention of Village Clerk Cathy Haley at 27 Riverside Road, Riverside,

Illinois 60546. Emailed and written comments timely received will be read into the record during the public hearing. While emailed or written comments are encouraged, public comment may also be made during the hearing by participating through Zoom. The Zoom Meeting ID and access code will be made available on the Village's website prior to the hearing. If you have questions regarding communication to the Commission during the meeting, please contact Community Development Director Sonya Abt at 708-447-1241 ext. 238.

The public hearings may be continued from time to time without further notice, except as otherwise required under the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

Dated this 6th day of May, 2020.

Jill Mateo, Chairperson
Planning and Zoning Commission

Sonya Abt

From: Suzanne Mooney
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2020 5:59 PM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: Public Hearing for Shelly and Bart Richards

Hi Sonya,

I am writing in support of Application No: PZ20-001, the addition of a fence on the property at 711 & 715 Arlington Road. I live two blocks away at the corner of Lindberg and Harlem and walk past the home of Shelly and Bart Richards at least twice a day, often more. I am in support of the fence and encourage you to approve their request for a variance.

Sincerely,
Suzanne Mooney

Sonya Abt

From: Suzanna Paredes
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 11:08 AM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: Re: 715 Arlington Rd new Fence

Good morning Sonya,

We hope you are well!

My name is Suzanna Paredes and we live at 719 Arlington Rd. We are neighbors of the Richards Family. The Richards are inquiring to install a 4ft fence on their property. We are in favor of a fence and feel that the fence would be a nice and strategically placed privacy fence that would allow their puppy Mini the ability to roam freely in their yard. As a dog owner, we can appreciate a fenced yard.

Stay safe!

Thank you!
Suzanna Paredes
719 Arlington Rd

Sent from my iPhone

Sonya Abt

From: Gian Ricco
Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2020 1:51 PM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: Application No. PZ20-001

Dear Ms. Abt:

I would like to provide input regarding the following variance application:

- **No PZ20-001**
- **Petitioners: Shelly and Bart Richards**
- **Address: 711 and 715 Arlington**

I am in full support of this application. I have known Bart and Shelly for many, many years. The pride with which they care for their property, through meticulous maintenance of and investment in their home and gardens, contributes the overall elegance and beauty of Riverside.

A modest four-foot high aluminum fence set approximately 40' back from their property line to the north and 100' from their property line to the east will in no way impact the surrounding neighborhood's aesthetics, sight lines, or feel. Rather, it will simply offer the Richards and their two children the same basic convenience that we enjoy... namely, to allow their small pet dog Minnie to be outside without risk of getting out, running two blocks east to Harlem, etc.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact either Gian a. _____ or Amy at _____

Finally, thank you for your service and dedication to the Village; it is very much noted and appreciated!

With sincere thanks,
Gian and Amy Ricco
471 Kent Road



Gian G. Ricco
Managing Director – Investment Banking
Stout Risius Ross Advisors, LLC
One South Wacker Drive, 38th Floor, Chicago, IL 60606
D +1.312.752.3359 | M +1.312.952.3433 | gricco@stout.com

RELENTLESS EXCELLENCE
stout.com

Sonya Abt

From: Julie Avina
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2020 10:01 AM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: Variation application - PZ20-001

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing in response to application # PZ20-001 with the zoning and planning commission of Riverside, IL. As a resident on Arlington Road, I have visited Shelly and Bart Richards at 215 Arlington and have seen their plans for a fence. I personally feel it will not inhibit the esthetics of Riverside or our block and support their application for approval.

Thank you for your time.

Julie Avina
735 Arlington Road
Riverside, IL 60546

Sonya Abt

From: The Burda Family
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 9:38 AM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: 711 and 715 Arlington Variation Application

May 20, 2020

Ms. Sonya Abt

Community Development Director

27 Riverside Rd.

Riverside, IL 60546

Dear Ms. Abt:

After receiving a visit and a letter from Mr. Richards requesting us to specifically email you to express our support of the building of a fence at 711/715 Arlington Rd, we decided to write to you. We live at 451 Kent Rd, kitty corner to Mr. Richards' house. After much thought and consideration, we cannot support his request for the erection of this permanent structure for the following reasons:

- 1) Due to our property being located on the point of Kent, Lindberg, and Arlington Roads, we will have a clear view of this fence. For 25 years, we have enjoyed the advantage of not having the typical backyard view of neighbor's yards and fences, but one of green, open spaces. The disadvantages of living on the point is not having privacy or a fence of our own. However, after raising five children in our home, we have vigilantly supervised our small children safely outside over the years, while enjoying the view from all three "front yards". It seems somewhat unjust, that we would only have the disadvantages and not the advantages of living on the point if this fence is approved;
- 2) Newly installed landscaping, located directly along Lindberg Rd. on the 711 property, clearly establishes privacy as a priority. Although 95% of the 711 property remains open space, it is private open space on the homeowner's side of the landscaping. Open space to the neighborhood has actually significantly been reduced. Our concern is if a fence is

approved, this trend for desired privacy will be solidified with a future request to relocate the fence much closer to Lindberg Rd;

3) There are clearly other non-invasive options to meet the Richards' needs. We have been friendly neighbors and are also fond of their dog. Mr. Richards explained to us that the fence was needed for their dog in the winter. We have offered to walk their dog for them. Our son would love to walk their dog in the winter or summer.

We are grateful for the rules established that govern these types of issues in the Village of Riverside. We trust this Historical Landmark "which was created by its founders to have green, open spaces where form and function follow nature" will continue to be enjoyed by all members of this community. We, therefore, respectfully request the variance application for 711/715 Arlington be denied.

Respectively,

Mr. & Mrs. Brian Burda

451 Kent Rd.

Riverside, IL 60546

Brian and Dawn Burda

Sonya Abt

From: Nancy DeCola
Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2020 2:55 PM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: APPLICATION NO.: PZ20-001 PETITIONERS: SHELLY & BART RICHARDS

Village of Riverside
Attn: Sonya Abt

Re: Application No.: PZ20-001
Petitioners: Shelly & Bart Richards
Property: 711 & 715 Arlington Rd

This email is regarding the request for Bart & Shelly Richards to install a fence on said property at 711 & 715 Arlington Rd.

Mike and I are neighbors of the Richards and reside at 439 Lindberg Rd. We do not have a problem with the fence installation on their property. We back them 100% with the design.

Should you need any additional feedback on this issue, please feel free to contact us.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Nancy & Mike DeCola

PLEASE NOTE our new address below:

Nancy DeCola

MDI TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS

10430 Woodward Ave.
Woodridge, IL 60517



Sonya Abt

From: janet madia
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 4:33 PM
To: Sonya Abt
Subject: Bart and ShellyRichards' proposed fence

I am Janet Madia, and my husband, Joseph Madia and I reside at 474 Lindberg Rd., a block from the Richard's. They shared the fence proposal with us, and we strongly support the proposal. We believe it will have no effect on property values and will enhance their property, as well as the surrounding area.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have questions.

**VILLAGE OF RIVERSIDE, ILLINOIS
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

Notice is hereby given to all interested persons that a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Riverside will be held on Wednesday, May 27, 2020 at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the business of the Planning and Zoning Commission may permit, to consider an application from the Village of Riverside for text amendments to the Village of Riverside Zoning Ordinance regarding Planned Unit Developments.

Due to the ongoing public health emergency, and based on the authority provided by Executive Order 2020-07, issued by Governor Pritzker on March 16, 2020, as most recently extended by Executive Order 2020-33, dated April 30, 2020, and in accordance with Executive Order 2020-32 issued by Governor Pritzker on April 30, limiting public gatherings and suspending the Open Meetings Act physical presence requirement, this meeting will be conducted electronically. It will be streamed live via Zoom and on Riverside Television, where it will be available on YouTube's Riverside TV channel. The Zoom Meeting ID and access code will be made available on the Village's website prior to the hearing. Video of the public hearing will subsequently be posted and made available to the public on the Village website.

The Village of Riverside is proposing text amendments to add a new Chapter 13 (Planned Unit Developments) of the Zoning Ordinance (Title 10). These amendments include the creation of procedures and requirements for Planned Unit Developments to allow flexibility in the application of the standards of this zoning ordinance based upon procedural protections providing for detailed review of individual significant proposals that are in the public interest and provide a public benefit, adding Planned Unit Developments as Special Uses in Sections 10-4-5 (Use and Bulk Requirement Tables) Table 2: Residential District Permitted Uses and 10-5-9 (Use and Bulk Requirement Tables) Table 4: Business Districts Permitted Uses and make such other conforming changes to other sections of the Village of Riverside Zoning Ordinance as may be necessary.

Application No.: PZ20-002
Petitioner: Village of Riverside
Text Amendments will be Applicable Throughout the Village

Copies of the proposed text amendments are available for inspection at the office of the Village Clerk, 27 Riverside Road, Riverside, Illinois 60546. Copies may also be obtained by emailing the Village's Community Development Director Sonya Abt at sabt@riverside.il.us or by telephone at 708-447-1241 ext. 238, or the Village Clerk at 708-447-2700 at any time prior to the meeting.

Public comments are welcome on the proposed text amendments that are the subject of the Public Hearing when received by email or in writing by the Village Clerk prior to 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Emailed comments may be sent to Community Development

Director Sonya Abt at sabt@riverside.il.us. Written comments may be submitted via U.S. mail or in the dropbox outside of Township Hall to the attention of Village Clerk Cathy Haley at 27 Riverside Road, Riverside, Illinois 60546. Emailed and written comments timely received will be read into the record during the public hearing. While emailed or written comments are encouraged, public comment may also be made during the hearing by participating through Zoom. The Zoom Meeting ID and access code will be made available on the Village's website prior to the hearing. If you have questions regarding communication to the Commission during the meeting, please contact Community Development Director Sonya Abt at 708-447-1241 ext. 238.

The public hearings may be continued from time to time without further notice, except as otherwise required under the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

Dated this 6th day of May, 2020

Jill Mateo, Chairperson
Planning and Zoning Commission