

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MINUTES  
MARCH 23, 2010

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Richard Garrity at 7:31 p.m. Board Members Gregory Constantino, Barbara Fried, Edward Kolar, Mary Ozog and Dale Siligmuller were present. Board Member Michael Waterman was excused. Also present were Trustee Liaison Pete Ladesic, Building and Zoning Official Joe Kvapil and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback.

Chairman Garrity described the proceedings of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Board Member Fried moved, seconded by Board Member Kolar, to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2010 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

One public hearing was on the agenda for the property at 734 Main Street.

PUBLIC HEARING – 734 MAIN STREET

A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF A VARIATION FROM THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE, SECTION 10-4-8(E)1, TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SCREEN PORCH ADDITION TO AN EXISTING HOME THAT RESULTS IN A LOT COVERAGE RATIO OF 22.8% IN LIEU OF THE MAXIMUM PERMITTED LOT COVERAGE RATIO OF 20%.

*(John and Martha Schoenfeld, owners)*

Staff Report

Building and Zoning Official Joe Kvapil stated that John and Martha Schoenfeld, the owners of the property at 734 Main Street, are requesting a variation from the Zoning Code in order to construct a new screen porch addition to their existing home that results in a lot coverage ratio of 22.8% in lieu of the maximum permitted lot coverage ratio of 20%. Mr. Kvapil displayed various photographs of the subject property. He also displayed an area map and described the location of the subject property which is in the R2 Residential zoning district. Mr. Kvapil reviewed a history of building permits issued for the subject property and stated that Village records indicate no variations have been granted at that location. Mr. Kvapil displayed a site plan and indicated the location of the proposed screen porch addition at the rear and to the south of the home. He stated that the 175-square foot screen porch will increase the lot coverage ratio from a nonconforming 21.6% to 22.8%. Mr. Kvapil explained that the lot coverage ratio was reduced from 25% to 20% in 2002. He stated that the two exceptions that allow up to a 25% LCR are a straight-up addition over a house and the reconstruction of a destroyed house. The subject variation is not one of those exceptions.

Petitioners' Presentation

John and Martha Schoenfeld, the owners and petitioners, and Steven Poteracki, their architect, with Studio 1 Architects, 1105 Burlington Avenue, Western Springs, Illinois, were present. Mr. Poteracki stated that the current lot coverage ratio at the subject site is 21.6% and the petitioners are requesting a 1.2% increase to 22.8%. He stated that the subject house was originally designed to be under the 25% lot coverage ratio allowed at that time so that an addition could possibly be built in the future.

Mr. Schoenfeld stated that they moved into their home 10 years ago. He stated that when a new house was constructed next door to the north five years ago, two large oak trees were removed which destroyed the tree canopy. At that time, a large garage was also constructed within their back yard view which adversely affects their air and light. Mr. Schoenfeld also stated that there are now flooding issues in their back yard from the north and that they have installed plantings to try to mitigate the problem. He stated there are no water issues from the neighbors' property to the south. Mr. Schoenfeld added that the neighbors to the north have a swimming pool and outdoor parties which create a loss of privacy for the petitioners. As a result, the petitioners would like to "retreat" to the south side of their home and would like to construct a screen room to avoid mosquitoes. The petitioners added that all of their neighbors are in favor of their variation request.

Responses to Questions from the ZBA

Mr. Schoenfeld responded to Mr. Constantino that the flooding does not create a hazardous condition and that the rear patio does not flood and will remain as is. Mr. Poteracki responded to Ms. Ozog that usable floor space in the sun room would be 12' x 12'.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Petition

No persons spoke in favor of or in opposition to the variation request.

Comments from the ZBA

All but one of the ZBA members were in favor of the variation requested by the petitioners. Those in favor felt that there were unique circumstances because the construction of a new house, garage and pool next door has created adverse effects for the petitioners that include water issues, diminished light and air and increased noise. They also felt that the variation request was minimal. Mr. SiligmueLLer stated that the petitioners kept their LCR under 25% when their home was built so that they could build an addition in the future, however, Mr. Kolar, who was opposed to the variation request, pointed out that the lot coverage ratio code change occurred seven years ago. Mr. Kolar suggested that staff check on the impervious surface area at the house to the north of the petitioners.

Motion

Ms. Fried moved, seconded by Ms. Ozog, to recommend that the Village Board approve a variation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code, Section 10-4-8(E)1 due to the unique circumstances that the construction of a new house, garage and pool next door has created adverse effects for the petitioners that include water issues, diminished light and air and increased noise. They also recommended approval because they felt that the variation request was minimal. The recommendation for approval was based on the conditions that the construction is in compliance with the plans as submitted at this public hearing and that the screen porch cannot be made into a year-round room.

The motion carried with five (5) "yes" votes and one (1) "no" vote as follows: Board Members Fried, Ozog, Constantino, Siligmuller and Chairman Garrity voted yes; Board Member Kolar voted no.

Trustee Report

No Trustee report was given.

Staff Report

Mr. Kvapil stated that the next regularly scheduled ZBA meeting will be cancelled and that there will be one item on the agenda for the April 27, 2010 meeting.

There being no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, the meeting was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Submitted by:

Barbara Utterback  
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:

Joe Kvapil  
Building & Zoning Official