



**RIVER FOREST  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING AGENDA**

A meeting of the River Forest Zoning Board of Appeals will be held on Thursday, April 8, 2021 at 7:30 P.M. in the Community Room of the River Forest Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

Physical attendance at this public meeting is limited to 36 individuals, with Zoning Board of Appeals officials, staff and consultants having priority over members of the public. Public comments and any responses will be read into the public meeting record. You may submit your public comments via email in advance of the meeting to: Clifford Radatz at [cradatz@vrf.us](mailto:cradatz@vrf.us). You may listen to the meeting by clicking here <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85302127286> or participating in a telephone conference call as follows, dial-in number: 1-312-626-6799 with meeting id: 853 0212 7286. If you would like to participate over the phone, please contact Clifford Radatz by telephone at (708) 714-3557 or by email at [cradatz@vrf.us](mailto:cradatz@vrf.us) by 12:00 pm on Thursday, April 8, 2021.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the Minutes from the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on March 11, 2021
- III. Approval of Findings of Fact for the Proposed Variation Request for 7612 Vine Street - Side Yard Setback for a home with an existing non-conforming Side Yard Setback.
- IV. Approval of Findings of Fact for the Proposed Variation Request for 1018 Park Avenue – Side Yard and Combined Side Yard Setbacks.
- V. Text Amendment Request - Proposed Amendment(s) to Section 10-19-3(A) of the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance:
  - a. Discussion regarding Proposed Text Amendments (Affordable Housing Plan)
  - b. Deliberation and Recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees regarding Proposed Text Amendments (Affordable Housing Plan)
  - c. Approval of Findings of Fact regarding Proposed Text Amendments (Affordable Housing Plan)
- VI. Confirmation of Next Meeting – May 13, 2021
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. Adjournment

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES**  
March 11, 2021

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Zoning Board of Appeals was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 11, 2021 in the Community Room of the River Forest Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Martin called the public hearing to order at 7:37 p.m.

Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: Members Dombrowski, Lucchesi, Schubkegel, Smetana and Chairman Martin.

Absent: Member Berni

Also Present: Secretary Clifford Radatz, Acting Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Village Attorney Carmen P. Forte, Jr.

**II. APPROVAL OF February 11, 2021 ZBA MEETING MINUTES**

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Lucchesi to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Ayes: Dombrowski, Lucchesi, Schubkegel, and Martin

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion passed.

**III. PETITION FOR A PROPOSED ZONING VARIATION REQUEST - 7612 VINE STREET  
- PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Martin called the public hearing to order

Secretary Radatz read the attestation and swore in all parties wishing to speak.

Rosemary McAdams and Quinn Brennolt, property owners/applicants, presented their petition for a zoning variance with regard to a side yard setback for a home with an existing non-conforming side yard setback. Mrs. McAdams stated that she and her husband need the setback to add a second floor addition to the home to provide more space for their growing

family. She stated that they have spoken with both of their neighbors who expressed that they do not have any issues with the variance, and they received a letter of support from their neighbors to the west.

The McAdams' architect, Mark Zinni, described the property as an unusually small site for River Forest standards at just over a total of 1,000 sq. ft. with a width of only 37 ½ feet and a depth of 134 ft. Mr. Zinni stated that the owners are looking to extend the existing side yard setback vertically/upward, for which they are seeking an exemption for the non-conforming addition. The setback is currently at 2 ft. 10.5", and the minimum setback requirement is 5 ft. for a standard 50 ft. wide lot. They are also seeking an extension for the overhanging eave, to maintain the current aesthetics of the home. Mr. Zinni presented Exhibit A, which is the survey of the lot showing the width (37 ½ ft.), the depth (134 ft.), the west side yard setback (2 ft. 10.5"), and the east side yard setback which is approximately 13 ft.

Mr. Zinni claimed the property presents a specific hardship because the lot is smaller than the standard 50 ft. width and has no alley access, which forces the owners to comply with the garage standard - to place the garage in the back and have the driveway on one side with a non-conforming side yard setback on the other. Further, Mr. Zinni stated that it is the only house on the block that is one-story, and all other houses already possess the setback condition the owners are seeking.

Mr. Zinni stated that the height of the second floor addition would be 29 ft. 2", which is within the 32 ft. limit, and the floor area would be increased to the maximum allowed. Mr. Zinni showed the Board member various plans and proposed drawings for the addition. Mr. Zinni confirmed that the addition was not going to exceed the permitted floor ratio or lot coverage.

Mr. Zinni stated that the unique physical character of the property is not due to the actions of any person with interest in the property, the condition for the petition is not based other applicants in the same zoning classification (R2) because most of them are 50 ft. or have alley access, and the proposed variation is not predominantly for the desire of economic gain evidenced by the intent of the owners to stay in the home once the addition is constructed. He also stated that the addition would not be injurious to the public health, welfare or environment, and would not adversely affect the neighbors' properties because the proposed variation would not change the general nature of the property (single family residential) or the width of the setbacks. Mr. Zinni claimed that the addition would not limit access to light or ventilation to the neighbors, emphasizing that their total combined setback footage (15 ½ ft.) would exceed the minimum of 15 ft. for the larger standard 50 ft. wide lots. He also claimed that there would be no further tax on public utilities. Finally, Mr. Zinni claimed that there is no other means by which the hardship can be remedied to permit a reasonable use of the subject property, because without the variation, the rear addition would have to be removed, which would involve foundational issues which could affect the neighbors and would also require a variation as a non-conforming use.

Mr. Martin asked the Board members if they had any questions for the applicants. Member Lucchesi asked Mr. Zinni about the width of the driveway on the West side, which he

confirmed was just under 13 ft. Mr. Martin asked Mr. Zinni what the impact of the second floor's shadow will be on the North side neighboring property when the sun is shining in the South. Mr. Zinni stated that would not be an issue, but the most concern would be the shadow effect on the East or West side neighbors when the sun is rising or setting, but he claimed it would not be an issue given the side yard driveways which give space between the houses.

Chairman Martin closed the public portion of the hearing.

Members Dombrowski and Lucchesi stated their support for the plan. Member Smetana stated that he agreed that there was not a lot that could be done with the lot because of the side yard driveway that wraps around the back. He agreed that there was no room to extend out and that extending the house up vertically is the only practicable way to use the property given the small width of the property.

A MOTION was made by Member Lucchesi and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends to the Village Board of Trustees that the requested variances be granted.

Ayes: Smetana, Schubkegel, Dombrowski, Lucchesi and Martin  
Nays: None  
Motion passed.

### **III. PETITION FOR A ZONING VARIATION REQUEST - 1018 PARK AVENUE - PUBLIC HEARING**

Chairman Martin called the public hearing to order.

Secretary Radatz read the attestation and swore in all parties wishing to speak.

John Hague, architect for the project, introduced the owners of the property, Greg and Amanda Palivos. He described their house as a two-story Colonial home, and the owners are seeking a side yard setback variation to allow them to enlarge their house in light of their second pregnancy. The owners have two vehicles that they would like to store inside, and their backyard experiences severe flooding issues that would preclude a garage located in the rear of the yard. Mr. Hague stated that the best place to put the garage would be the front of the house to the South, and to do this the side yard setback would need to be reduced from 7.5 ft. to 3.75 ft. to allow for a 24 ft. wide garage. The existing house is 2600 sq. ft., and the owners are trying to enlarge it to 4800 sq. ft., for a family room addition and a master bedroom, on a lot that allows up to 6500 sq. ft. house. The owners are requesting two variations: (1) the reduction of the side yard setback from 7.5 ft. to 3.75 ft., and (2) a variation for the combined side yard setback from 18.75 ft. to 13.95 ft. The owners have letters of support from both of their adjoining neighbors regarding both requests. The house to the South is located 6 ft. from the property line.

Member Dombrowski asked if the neighbors to the North and the South agreed with the proposed addition, and Mr. Hague presented letters of support from both. Member Lucchesi asked about the plans for the existing driveway, which Mr. Hague said they would remove.

Greg Palivos, the property owner, spoke to the Board and thanked them for hearing their variation requests. He stated that his family's intent is to stay in River Forest, where his wife was raised and where her parents still reside.

Chairman Martin closed the public portion of the hearing.

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Lucchesi that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that the requested variation be granted.

Member Dombrowski stated that the variance was a large one but that he believed all eight standards had been met.

Ayes: Dombrowski, Lucchesi, and Schubkegel

Nays: Martin and Smetana

Motion passed.

Village Attorney Forte noted that, according to the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance, a vote on a recommendation for a major variation must receive (4) affirmative votes from the Zoning Board of Appeals to be considered a positive recommendation to the Village Board. Therefore, this application will have to receive a 2/3 vote of the Board of Trustees to be approved, and the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be to deny the variation request.

#### **IV. TEXT AMENDMENT REQUEST - SECTION 10-19-3(A) OF THE VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST ZONING ORDINANCE - STANDARDS OF REVIEW FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS**

Chairman Martin welcomed Acting Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner to present a petition from the Village of River Forest.

Ms. Scheiner presented the petition on behalf of the Village, and described the history of the Village's adoption of its affordable housing plan, as required by state statute. She noted that the proposed text amendment is to amend section 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, which is the first standard of review required for the Development Review Board when reviewing a proposed planned development. The standard states that the "proposed use or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan." The Village adopted an amended comprehensive plan two years prior which included a recommendation for development of an affordable housing plan. The proposed standard under the text amendment would read "the proposed use or combination of uses is

consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the affordable housing plan.”

Chairman Martin stated that he did not like the amendment and that he would be voting against it. He stated he felt this way because there are a number of statutes and ordinances, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which should be considered as part of the review of planned development projects, in addition to the affordable housing plan. He did not like that the proposed amendment singles out the affordable housing plan. He would prefer the amendment to read “proposed uses or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and all other relevant ordinances and statutes.” Ms. Scheiner stated that she understood his concerns, but stated that the ADA and other statutes are already considered in planned developments. She also stated that the affordable housing plan is not an ordinance or a statute but a policy statement similar to a comprehensive plan.

Member Smetana asked if the affordable housing plan requires that the comprehensive plan itself be changed to support the goals of the affordable housing plan. Ms. Scheiner answered that it does not. She stated that the comprehensive plan is a policy statement for the Village, and that it already asks that the Village pass an affordable housing plan in accordance with the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeals Act. She noted that the comprehensive plan will not be changed, but specific issues such as bulk standards that will have to be changed to support the affordable housing plan (which are not at issue at this time) will be completed through text amendments which will be brought to the Zoning board of Appeals at a later time.

Chairman Martin asked if the later proposals will include amendments to the Zoning Ordinance or Development Ordinance to implement the affordable housing plan. He clarified that these kinds of amendments are not at issue at this hearing, and that the only thing at issue at the instant hearing is to consider a simple amendment to one of the review standards that the Development Review Board considers, which Ms. Scheiner affirmed.

Ms. Scheiner also stated that the standards in the Planned Development Ordinance were amended to take into account accessibility for individuals with disabilities.

Attorney Forte stated that the legal notice regarding the proposed text amendment was directed to a very specific change to the Zoning Ordinance, and because the notice is so

specific to the proposed amendment mentioning the affordable housing plan, he would not recommend proposing any additional text amendments in the confines of the hearing.

Chairman Martin called for any motions on the proposed text amendment, and none were made.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Martin called for a motion to adjourn.

At 8:22 p.m., a MOTION to adjourn was made by Member Lucchesi and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski.

Ayes: Dombrowski, Lucchesi, Smetana, Schubkegel, and Martin  
Nays: None.  
Motion passed.

Ayes:  
Nays:

Respectfully Submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cliff Radatz, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frank Martin, Chairman  
Zoning Board of Appeals

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING  
SIDE YARD SETBACK VARIATIONS RELATED TO A  
SECOND FLOOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AT 7612 VINE STREET**

**WHEREAS**, petitioners Rosemary McAdams and Quinn Brennolt (together the “Petitioners”), owners of the property located at 7612 Vine Street in the Village of River Forest (“Property”), requested certain variations from the Village of River Forest’s side yard setback requirements pursuant to Sections 10-9-7 and 10-8-7(C)(2)(b) of the Village of River Forest Zoning Code (“Zoning Ordinance”) related to the construction of a second story addition on the residence at the Property that would create a side yard setback to the west of two feet and ten-and-a-half inches (2’ 10 1/2”), which would require a variation of approximately two feet and one-and-a-half inches (2’ 1 1/2”) for a length of approximately thirty feet (30’), and a side yard eave setback of one foot and two and three sixteenths inches (1’ 2 3/16”), which would require a variation of approximately one foot and nine and thirteen sixteenths inches (1’ 9 13/16”) (together the “Variations”). The Property is located in the R-2 Single-Family (Detached) Residential Zoning District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Village of River Forest Zoning Board of Appeals (“Board”) held a public hearing on the question of whether the requested Variations should be granted on March 11, 2021, and was held as required by Section 10-5-4(E) of the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning Ordinance”). At the public hearing, all persons present and wishing to speak were given an opportunity to be heard and all evidence that was tendered was received and considered by the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, public notice in the form required by law was given of said public hearing by publication not more than thirty (30) days nor less than fifteen (15) days prior to said public hearing in the *Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village, there being no newspaper published in the Village. In addition, notice was mailed to surrounding property owners; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing on March 11, 2021, the Petitioners, and their architect, Mark Zinni, provided information and testimony regarding the requested Variations, testifying, among other things, that the proposed addition will add value to their property and the neighboring properties, and that if they were required to build the addition to the home without the variations, they would have to demolish a considerable amount of the pre-existing first floor living space to accommodate a livable addition to the Property, which created a hardship that required the Variations be granted; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board, having considered the criteria set forth in Section 10-5-4 of the Zoning Ordinance, by a vote of 4 – 0, recommends to the Village President and Board of Trustees that the requested Variations for the Property be APPROVED.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Board makes the following findings of fact and recommendations pursuant to Section 10-5-4(E)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance:



## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **The physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the Property constitute a specific hardship upon the owner as distinguished from an inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.** The evidence presented at the public hearing established the unique characteristic of the Property that constitutes a specific hardship on the Petitioners, as the home on the Property is smaller in size and on a thirty-five foot (35') lot. The Board found that the Petitioners would have to demolish a significant portion of their first floor to create a livable addition to the Property. The Board finds this standard has been met.
2. **The aforesaid unique physical condition did not result from any action of any person having an interest in the property, but was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of the Village's Zoning Regulations, for which no compensation was paid.** The Board finds this standard has been met, as the location of the home on the Property was established when the home was built, well before the Petitioners purchased it.
3. **The conditions of the Property upon which the petition for Variations is based may not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification.** The Board found that the conditions on the Property are unique, and atypical for the area, in that most of the properties on the same block have lots that are fifty feet (50') in width, and already contain two story homes. The Board finds this standard has been met.
4. **The purpose of the Variations is not based predominately upon a desire for economic gain.** The Petitioners noted that their desire for the Variations is not predominantly for economic gain, but instead to allow for a more aesthetically pleasing addition to the residence on the Property, in which the Petitioners indicated they intend to continue to inhabit. The Board finds this standard has been met.
5. **The granting of the Variations is not detrimental to the public welfare or unduly injurious to the enjoyment, use, or development value of other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the Property is located.** The proposed addition would be adequately set back from the properties to the east and west, due to driveways separating the properties, which would not be detrimental to the value of those surrounding properties. The Board finds this standard has been met.
6. **The granting of the Variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire, or otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.** The spacing between the adjoining properties, due to the driveways between them, would not impair an adequate supply of light to the properties. The Board finds this standard has been met.

7. **The granting of the Variations will not unduly tax public utilities and facilities in the area of the Property.** If granted, the Variations would not unduly burden public utilities or facilities in the area of the Property. This Board finds this standard was met.

8. **There are no means other than the requested Variations by which the hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the Property.** The testimony and evidence presented at the public hearing showed that rear yard addition to the residence on the Property constructed without the Variations would require demolition of a significant portion of the first floor of the home. The Board finds this standard has been met.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Board, by a vote of 4-0, for the reasons stated above, recommended to the Village President and Board of Trustees that the proposed Variations for construction to build a second floor addition on the Property in the R-2 Single-Family (Detached) Residential Zoning District be APPROVED.

---

**Frank Martin**  
**Chairman**

---

**Date**

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING  
SIDE YARD SETBACK VARIATIONS RELATED TO A  
SECOND FLOOR RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AT 1018 PARK AVENUE**

**WHEREAS**, petitioners Gregory and Amanda Pavilos (together the “Petitioners”), owners of the property located at 1018 Park Avenue in the Village of River Forest (“Property”), requested certain variations from the Village of River Forest’s side yard setback requirements pursuant to Sections 10-9-7 and 10-8-7(C)(2)(b) of the Village of River Forest Zoning Code (“Zoning Ordinance”) related to the construction of a two (2) story addition containing an attached garage on the residence at the Property that would create a side yard setback to the south of three feet and nine inches (3’ 9”), which would require a variation of approximately three feet and nine inches (3’ 9”) for a length of approximately twenty-seven feet, two and-a-half inches (27’ 2 1/2”), and which would create a combined side yard setback of thirteen feet and eleven and-a-half inches (13’ 11 1/2”), which would require a variation of approximately five feet and seven inches (5’ 7”) (together the “Variations”). The Property is located in the R-2 Single-Family (Detached) Residential Zoning District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Village of River Forest Zoning Board of Appeals (“Board”) held a public hearing on the question of whether the requested Variations should be granted on March 11, 2021, and was held as required by Section 10-5-4(E) of the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning Ordinance”). At the public hearing, all persons present and wishing to speak were given an opportunity to be heard and all evidence that was tendered was received and considered by the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, public notice in the form required by law was given of said public hearing by publication not more than thirty (30) days nor less than fifteen (15) days prior to said public hearing in the *Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village, there being no newspaper published in the Village. In addition, notice was mailed to surrounding property owners; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing on March 11, 2021, the Petitioners, and their architect, Jonathon Hague, provided information and testimony regarding the requested Variations, testifying, among other things, that the proposed addition will add value to their property and the neighboring properties, and that excessive flooding in their rear yard would prevent them from constructing a detached garage at the back of the Property, which created a hardship that required the Variations be granted; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board, having considered the criteria set forth in Section 10-5-4 of the Zoning Ordinance, by a vote of 3 – 2, recommends to the Village President and Board of Trustees that the requested Variations for the Property be DENIED, as the Variations failed to receive at least four (4) votes in favor, per Section 10-5-4(E)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** the Board makes the following findings of fact and recommendations pursuant to Section 10-5-4(E)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance:

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. **The physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the Property constitute a specific hardship upon the owner as distinguished from an inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.** The evidence presented at the public hearing did not establish any unique characteristic of the Property that constitutes a specific hardship on the Petitioners. The Board found that the Petitioners could locate a detached garage to the rear of the Property, which would not require them to request the Variations. The Petitioners did not prove that a hardship would result if they were unable to obtain the Variations. The Board finds this standard has not been met.

2. **The aforesaid unique physical condition did not result from any action of any person having an interest in the property, but was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of the Village's Zoning Regulations, for which no compensation was paid.** Given its finding on Standard 1 above, the Board finds this standard has not been met, as location of the home on the Property, and the home at 1010 Park Avenue, were in the same location prior to the Petitioners' acquisition of the Property.

3. **The conditions of the Property upon which the petition for Variations is based may not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification.** The Board found that the conditions on the Property are not unique, but are instead typical for the area. The Board finds this standard has not been met.

4. **The purpose of the Variations is not based predominately upon a desire for economic gain.** There was no testimony or evidence presented that the Petitioners' desire for the Variations is predominantly for economic gain, but instead to allow for a more aesthetically pleasing addition to the residence on the Property, in which the Petitioners indicated they intend to continue to inhabit. The Board finds this standard has been met.

5. **The granting of the Variations is not detrimental to the public welfare or unduly injurious to the enjoyment, use, or development value of other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the Property is located.** A second floor addition built over the proposed garage of the Property would nearly abut the home located to the south at 1010 Park Avenue, which would be detrimental to the value of that property. The Board finds this standard has not been met.

6. **The granting of the Variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire, or otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.** A second floor addition built over the proposed garage of the

Property would nearly abut the home located to the south at 1010 Park Avenue. Due to the proximity of the homes, additional shadows could impair an adequate supply of light to the neighboring property, and could create a fire hazard to that property. The Board finds this standard has not been met.

7. **The granting of the Variations will not unduly tax public utilities and facilities in the area of the Property.** If granted, the Variations would not unduly burden public utilities or facilities in the area of the Property. This Board finds this standard was met.

8. **There are no means other than the requested Variations by which the hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the Property.** The testimony and evidence presented at the public hearing showed that a second floor and rear yard addition to the residence on the Property may be constructed without the Variations, and that a detached garage could also be constructed without the Variations. The Board finds this standard has not been met.

### RECOMMENDATION

The Board, by a vote of 3-2, for the reasons stated above, recommended to the Village President and Board of Trustees that the proposed Variations for construction to build an addition and attached garage on the Property in the R-2 Single-Family (Detached) Residential Zoning District be approved. However, pursuant to Section 10-5-4(E)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, any such variation which fails to receive a recommendation for approval of four (4) members of the Zoning Board of Appeals shall not be passed except by the favorable vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Board of Trustees. Therefore, the recommendation of the Board is that the Village President and Board of Trustees deny the requested Variations.

---

**Frank Martin**  
**Chairman**

---

**Date**

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING  
A PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST  
ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING STANDARDS OF REVIEW  
FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS**

**WHEREAS**, petitioner the Village of River Forest (“Village”), based upon direction from the Village President and Board of Trustees, has requested consideration of, and a public hearing on, an amendment to the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning Ordinance”), which was summarized as follows in the published public hearing notice:

A Text Amendment to Chapter 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding changes to the standards for review for Planned Developments to consider whether a proposed planned development is consistent with the goals and policies of the Affordable Housing Plan.

The above-listed amendment is described below as the “Proposed Text Amendment.”

**WHEREAS**, the Village’s Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”) held a public hearing on the question of whether the Proposed Text Amendment should be made on March 11, 2021, as required by Section 10-5-5 of the Zoning Ordinance, at which time all persons present and wishing to speak were given an opportunity to be heard and all evidence that was tendered was received and considered by the ZBA; and

**WHEREAS**, public notice in the form required by law was given of said public hearing by publication not more than thirty (30) days nor less than fifteen (15) days prior to said public hearing in the *Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village, there being no newspaper published in the Village; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner presented the Proposed Text Amendment on behalf of the Village; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, opportunity was provided for public comments, and no Village residents or other members of the public testified for or against the Proposed Text Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, after the close of the public hearing, the ZBA discussed and deliberated the Proposed Text Amendment, and on April 8, 2021, voted on recommendations regarding the Proposed Text Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, following discussion and deliberation, the ZBA, pursuant to Section 10-5-5(B)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, recommended the Village President and Board of Trustees approve the Proposed Text Amendment, as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof (“Recommended Text Amendment”);

**NOW THEREFORE**, the ZBA makes the following findings of fact and recommendations pursuant to Section 10-5-5(B)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance:

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

By a vote of \_\_\_ - \_\_\_, the ZBA recommends approval of the following Proposed Text Amendment. This Proposed Text Amendment is found to be in the best interests of the Village and its residents and property owners:

1. **The Proposed Amendment**, the text of which is in Exhibit A, which amends the standards for review of a proposed planned development, contained in Section 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, to include consistency with the goals and policies of the Affordable Housing Plan is recommended for APPROVAL as proposed.

---

Frank Martin  
Chairman

---

Date

**EXHIBIT A**

**RECOMMENDED TEXT AMENDMENT**

(attached)



Section 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, entitled “Standards for Review,” is amended to read in its entirety, as follows, with additions underlined:

“A. The proposed use or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the affordable housing plan;”

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING  
A PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST  
ZONING ORDINANCE REGARDING STANDARDS OF REVIEW  
FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS**

**WHEREAS**, petitioner the Village of River Forest (“Village”), based upon direction from the Village President and Board of Trustees, has requested consideration of, and a public hearing on, an amendment to the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning Ordinance”), which was summarized as follows in the published public hearing notice:

A Text Amendment to Chapter 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding changes to the standards for review for Planned Developments to consider whether a proposed planned development is consistent with the goals and policies of the Affordable Housing Plan.

The above-listed amendment is described below as the “Proposed Text Amendment.”

**WHEREAS**, the Village’s Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”) held a public hearing on the question of whether the Proposed Text Amendment should be made on March 11, 2021, as required by Section 10-5-5 of the Zoning Ordinance, at which time all persons present and wishing to speak were given an opportunity to be heard and all evidence that was tendered was received and considered by the ZBA; and

**WHEREAS**, public notice in the form required by law was given of said public hearing by publication not more than thirty (30) days nor less than fifteen (15) days prior to said public hearing in the *Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village, there being no newspaper published in the Village; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner presented the Proposed Text Amendment on behalf of the Village; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing, opportunity was provided for public comments, and no Village residents or other members of the public testified for or against the Proposed Text Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, after the close of the public hearing, the ZBA discussed and deliberated the Proposed Text Amendment, and on April 8, 2021, voted on recommendations regarding the Proposed Text Amendment; and

**WHEREAS**, following discussion and deliberation, the ZBA, pursuant to Section 10-5-5(B)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, recommended the Village President and Board of Trustees deny the Proposed Text Amendment, as set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof (“Recommended Text Amendment”);

**NOW THEREFORE**, the ZBA makes the following findings of fact and recommendations pursuant to Section 10-5-5(B)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance:

## FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

By a vote of \_\_\_ - \_\_\_, the ZBA recommends denial of the following Proposed Text Amendment. This Proposed Text Amendment is not found to be in the best interests of the Village and its residents and property owners:

1. **The Proposed Amendment**, the text of which is in Exhibit A, which amends the standards for review of a proposed planned development, contained in Section 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, to include consistency with the goals and policies of the Affordable Housing Plan is recommended for DENIAL as proposed.

---

Frank Martin  
Chairman

---

Date

**EXHIBIT A**

**RECOMMENDED TEXT AMENDMENT**

(attached)

Section 10-19-3(A) of the Zoning Ordinance, entitled "Standards for Review," is amended to read in its entirety, as follows, with additions underlined:

"A. The proposed use or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the affordable housing plan;"