

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
OCTOBER 27, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Rick Garrity at 7:02 p.m. ZBA Members James Bourke, Gregory Constantino, Larry LaVanway, John Micheli, Chip Miller and Thomas Whalls were present. Also present were Trustee Liaison Peter Ladesic, Building and Zoning Official Steve Witt and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback.

Chairperson Garrity explained the procedures of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

ZBA Member Bourke moved, seconded by ZBA Member LaVanway, to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2015 and October 13, 2015 Zoning Board of Appeals meetings.

On the agenda were two public hearings regarding the properties at 480 Greenfield Avenue and 817 Crescent Blvd.

PUBLIC HEARING – 480 GREENFIELD AVENUE

A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF VARIATIONS FROM THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE AS FOLLOWS: 1. SECTION 10-4-8(E)1 TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE RESULTING IN A LOT AREA COVERAGE RATIO OF APPROXIMATELY 22.66% IN LIEU OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE RATIO OF 20%. 2. ANY OTHER ZONING RELIEF NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT THE PROJECT AS DEPICTED ON THE PLANS PRESENTED OR REVISED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING OR AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE VILLAGE BOARD.

(Brian and Lee Birnbaum, Owners)

Staff Presentation

Building and Zoning Official Steve Witt stated that the petitioners for the property at 480 Greenfield Avenue are Brian and Lee Birnbaum and they are requesting a variation from Glen Ellyn Zoning Code Section 10-4-8(E)1 to allow the construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence resulting in a lot area coverage ratio of approximately 22.66% in lieu of the maximum allowable ratio of 20.00% and any other zoning relief necessary to construct the project as depicted on the plans presented or revised at the public hearing or at a public meeting of the Village Board. Mr. Witt displayed a map showing the subject property which he stated is an interior lot located in the R2 Zoning District on Greenfield Avenue between Sunset Avenue and Glenwood Avenue. He stated that the zoning and land use immediately surrounding the subject property is single-family residential and that a notice of public hearing for this property was published on October 9, 2015. Mr. Witt also stated no Village records were found that granted any previous zoning variations, however, several permits have been issued for this property in the past, including the subject house in 1950 and the garage in 1951.

Mr. Witt stated that the petitioners would like to construct an approximately 213-square foot three-season room and an approximately 30-square foot open porch addition with a wrap-around wood deck to the rear of the house. Mr. Witt displayed a current plat of survey and a floor plan showing the requested changes. He added that the addition and deck will replace an existing wood deck and will be approximately 282 square feet in area.

Chairman Garrity added that a letter was received from Daniel Conaway of 494 Greenfield Avenue stating that he was unable to attend this meeting but was supportive of the petitioners' request for a variation.

Petitioners' Presentation

Brian and Lee Birnbaum, the petitioners, and Architect Daryl Drake, 422 Phillips Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois were present to speak on behalf of the variation requests.

Mr. Drake stated that on the aerial map, the lot next door at 476 Greenfield Avenue is not represented properly as it was a teardown and is now a huge house that maximizes the lot coverage ratio. He added information not included in the petitioners' application packet that was distributed to the ZBA that the petitioners need additional space in their home when their family visits for vacations, a three-season room would benefit their growing family, extremely large homes are being built in Glen Ellyn and the petitioners are unable to add space vertically in their present home, therefore, they are asking for space in the rear of their home which will not be seen by the general public.

Mr. Drake stated that part of the petitioners' hardship is that when they bought this home many years ago, their existing garage was 40 feet over 500 square feet which they did not realize was over the allowed limit. He also stated that a small roofed-over area in the rear with a defined 6-inch by 6-inch column counts toward lot coverage ratio which is 60-plus square feet. He stated that a roofed-over addition was built on the front of the subject home five years ago and at that time the code stated that if one had an open 3-sided front porch, a certain amount of square footage was allowed for that porch to be built on the front of the house. He stated that the code is now being reviewed differently by the Building and Zoning Official and that the porch is 40 square feet over the allowed limit. He stated that the 120 square feet (40 + 40 + 40+) of area enormously impacts the square footage of what the petitioners are trying to do on the lot coverage of the subject property. ZBA Member Constantino asked what the new addition total would be if the 100-120 square feet was not included in the current lot coverage, and Mr. Drake responded approximately 160 square feet could be added and the petitioners would then be at 20% lot coverage ratio, however, that room would be very small. Mr. Drake added that the petitioners have a handicapped child who requires space when he visits. Mr. Drake stated that the variation request is very small and that the 120 square foot area added on to what they could technically have today which he believes is 48 square feet is a large part of their hardship.

Mr. Birnbaum stated that he and his wife moved into the subject home approximately 30 years ago and have always wanted to add a 3-season room or screened porch but were unable to do so for financial reasons. He stated that when they purchased their home, the lot coverage ratio maximum was 25%, however, that has since been reduced to 20%. Mr. Birnbaum stated that their oldest son who lives in southern Illinois is multi-handicapped and cannot use stairs; therefore, some additional space for him and other family members to use on the first floor is very important. He stated as he and his wife age, they will be unable to use stairs easily and the requested addition will be helpful for them.

Mr. Birnbaum displayed a photo of the rear of their house that showed their existing deck and the house next door at 476 Greenfield that gives them a lot of shade in the afternoon. He stated that their home is much smaller than many of their neighbors and that the proposed addition would not be seen from the street. He stated that a petition was signed by 20 of his neighbors in support of their variation request and he displayed it for the ZBA members. He added that the addition will also increase the value of their home. Mr. Birnbaum displayed photos of his backyard and stated they will still have one of the larger back yards on the block even after the requested variation is constructed. ZBA Member Micheli stated that a deck is a removable structure as opposed to an addition to a home.

Questions from the Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA Member Constantino asked if there are any drainage issues at the subject site. Mr. Drake responded that neither a drainage review nor a tree preservation plan will be required because the variation request is less than 300 square feet. Mr. Drake also responded that the addition will not be able to be seen from the front of the property. Mr. Drake also responded to ZBA Member Constantino that the proposed variation will create no adverse effect upon the neighbors' light, air, view, etc. ZBA Member Micheli asked if the deck in the rear will be on a concrete slab, and Mr. Drake responded yes and added that a perimeter foundation will also be required. Mr. Drake also responded to ZBA Member Micheli that 3-season rooms and 4-season rooms are basically the same although 3-season rooms are not air conditioned. Mr. Drake responded to ZBA Member Miller that the petitioners currently have 48 feet on which they could build a small room without a variation. He also responded to ZBA Member LaVanway that columns with roofs are counted as area. Mr. Drake added that stoops which he considers to be an area of the house have never been counted as lot coverage ratio in the Village. He also stated that many nonconformities were created in the Village when the lot coverage ratio was reduced to 20% from 25%.

Mr. Birnbaum responded to ZBA Member Micheli that that they kept the size of the proposed room smaller than they would have liked in order to meet their needs and be just slightly over the 20% lot coverage ratio. ZBA Member Micheli asked if the request could be reduced, and Mr. Birnbaum responded that if their request was not approved, they would just put a deck on

the rear. ZBA Member Whalls suggested that they reduce the entry area, and Mr. Birnbaum was agreeable.

ZBA Member Miller stated that the Birnbaums' son's health is not considered to be a hardship for a variation. Mr. Drake responded to ZBA Member Miller that the subject lot dimensions and square footage are both substandard and the smallest dimensions in the subject neighborhood.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Proposed Request

Tom Dudgeon, 470 Greenfield, Glen Ellyn, Illinois stated he has been a neighbor of the Birnbaums' for almost 30 years. He stated their lots are approximately the same size, however, the Dudgeons' house is taller. He stated that the home next to the Birnbaums' dwarfs it and blocks sunlight to the Birnbaums'. He stated there have been nine teardowns on his block in 34 years. Mr. Dudgeon stated he knows Jeff, the Birnbaums' son, who is profoundly disabled. He stated that when Jeff comes to his parents' home for an event, it is virtually impossible to find room for him in the house. He added that the petitioners' addition will be invisible from the street. He stated that the petitioners' home is miniscule in comparison to some of the homes built in the neighborhood. He felt that to not allow the petitioners to have a 2.6% variation is inequitable.

Denise Irons, 466 Greenfield, Glen Ellyn, Illinois stated that she lives in a home that was built after a teardown and was supportive of the variation being requested by the petitioners. She stated she did not see what difference it would make for that variation to be allowed as her neighbor's garage blocks her entire house and other nearby houses have no rear yard. She stated that all of the neighbors are supportive of the petitioners' request and they deserve the variation as no one will be negatively affected by their addition.

Findings of Fact

ZBA Member Constantino stated that Brian and Lee Birnbaum, owners of the property at 480 Greenfield, are seeking a variation to allow a lot area coverage ratio of 22.66% in lieu of the maximum allowable 20%. He stated that Building and Zoning Official Witt said that the petitioners are requesting a variation from Glen Ellyn Zoning Code Section 10-4-8(E)1 to allow the construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence resulting in a lot coverage ratio of approximately 22.66% in lieu of the maximum allowable ratio of 20.00% and any other zoning relief necessary to construct the project as depicted on the plans. He also stated that the petitioners' architect, Daryl Drake, stated that the petitioners would like to construct an approximately 213-square foot three-season room and an approximately 30-square foot open porch addition with a wrap-around wood deck to the rear of the house. ZBA Member Constantino stated that the hardship is that the lot is small and the circumstances creating the hardships are that there are small roofed-over areas at certain portions of the property that

are not living space but are included in the lot coverage ratio calculation. He stated over the years, the codes regarding living space have been interpreted differently by the Village building officials. ZBA Member Constantino stated there are no drainage issues and no tree preservation requirements nor will there be any detrimental effects on the neighbors. He added that the subject lot is 50 feet wide in lieu of the now required 66-foot lot. He stated that Brian Birnbaum, the owner of the property, received signatures from 20 neighbors in support of the proposed project. He stated that Mr. Birnbaum had reduced the original size of their request as the current size will meet their needs. ZBA Member Constantino stated that Thomas Dudgeon of 470 Greenfield spoke on behalf of the variation request and stated that nine homes in their neighborhood have been demolished with larger homes built in their place. He stated that because of the special needs of the Birnbaums' son, this variation request is minimal. ZBA Member Constantino stated that Denise Irons of 466 Greenfield felt that the variation being requested is very small and will not negatively impact the neighbors.

ZBA Member Bourke moved, seconded by ZBA Member Micheli, to approve the findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Comments from the Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA Member Bourke was in favor of the variation request especially due to the large home to the west. He also stated that the addition fits in well on the property. ZBA Member Constantino stated he also was in favor of the variation request as there will be no detriment to the public and no adverse effects on other properties in the neighborhood. He stated that the variation is minimal to make reasonable use of the land and added that there are also interpretations as to what portions of the property are included in the lot coverage. ZBA Member Whalls stated that the subject lot is very small and nonconforming and that he figured the lot coverage ratio to be 20.9%. He added that the streetscape views do not affect anything and the neighbors are in favor of the variation request. ZBA Member Micheli stated he was not in favor of granting the variation being requested by the petitioner and was not in favor of the 16 foot 4 inch permanent addition to the home. He stated he did not feel the streetscape was a strong argument. He added that he did not see a hardship for this request, however, would be supportive of a lesser request, perhaps something narrower at 12 feet. ZBA Member Miller stated that the subject home is in his neighborhood and he was supportive of the variation request. ZBA Member LaVanway was supportive of the variation requests, however, felt that rain and stormwater issues will occur in town if variations for lot coverage ratio continue to be granted. Chairperson Garrity also stated he was in favor of the subject variation request.

ZBA Member Bourke moved, seconded by ZBA Member Whalls, to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Motion

ZBA Member Miller moved, seconded by ZBA Member Whalls that after considering the application of Brian and Lee Birnbaum of 480 Greenfield Avenue to recommend approval of a variation from Section 10-4-8(E)1 to allow the construction of an addition to an existing single-family residence resulting in a lot area coverage ratio of approximately 22.66% in lieu of the maximum allowable ratio of 20.00% and to allow any other zoning relief necessary to construct the project as depicted on the plans presented or revised at the public hearing or at a public meeting of the Village Board after deliberations and the following: The subject lot is nonconforming in area and width and the lot coverage ratio of 20% makes it impossible for the petitioners to build any kind of livable space without a variation.

The motion carried with six (6) yes votes and one (1) no vote as follows: ZBA Members Miller, Whalls, Bourke, Constantino, LaVanway and Chairperson Garrity voted yes; ZBA Member Micheli voted no.

PUBLIC HEARING – 817 CRESCENT BOULEVARD

A REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF VARIATIONS FROM THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE AS FOLLOWS: 1. SECTION 10-4-1(H) TO ALLOW TWO (2) NON-CONTIGUOUS LOTS SEPARATED BY A PUBLIC ALLEY BUT IN COMMON OWNERSHIP, ONE CONFORMING AND ONE SUBSTANDARD IN LOT SIZE, TO BE DEVELOPED AND USED JOINTLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF FORMING AN EFFECTIVE AND CONFORMING ZONING LOT TO ALLOW THE RECONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED GARAGE ON THE SUBSTANDARD LOT; WHEREAS THE REFERENCED ZONING CODE SECTION APPLIES TO TWO (2) OR MORE CONTIGUOUS SUBSTANDARD LOTS OF RECORD OR PARTS OF LOTS OF RECORD. 2. SECTION 10-5-4(A)2(a) TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 644-SQUARE FOOT DETACHED GARAGE RESULTING IN AREA EQUAL TO APPROXIMATELY 32.56% OF THE REQUIRED REAR YARD IN LIEU OF THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE 30.00%. 3. SECTION 10-5-4(A)4(c) TO ALLOW FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AN EXISTING ATTACHED DECK IN KIND WITH A CORNER SIDE YARD SETBACK OF 8.50 FEET IN LIEU OF THE MINIMUM REQUIRED 18.00 FEET. 4. ANY OTHER ZONING RELIEF NECESSARY TO CONSTRUCT THE PROJECT AS DEPICTED ON THE PLANS PRESENTED OR REVISED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING OR AT A PUBLIC MEETING OF THE VILLAGE BOARD.

(Aaron and Denise Denman, Owners)

Staff Presentation

Building and Zoning Official Steve Witt stated that Aaron and Denise Denman, the petitioners, were present along with their architect, Sean Gordon of Gordon Architecture, Inc., 2193 Charlotte Court, Wheaton, Illinois. Mr. Witt stated that the petitioners' variation requests have two parts—the construction of a garage to replace the existing garage and the replacement of a deck that is in disrepair at basically the same location. He added that the petitioners are requesting the following variations from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code: 1. Section 10-4-1(H) to

allow two (2) non-contiguous lots separated by a public alley but in common ownership, one conforming and one substandard in size, to be developed and used jointly for the purpose of forming an effective and conforming zoning lot to allow the reconstruction of a detached garage on the substandard lot; whereas the referenced Zoning Code section applies to two (2) or more contiguous substandard lots of record or parts of lots of record. Mr. Witt displayed plats of the two lots—the front lot which is conforming and the rear lot which is not conforming and on which the garage is located. 2. Section 10-5-4(A)2(a) to allow the construction of a 644-square foot detached garage resulting in an area equal to approximately 32.56% of the required rear yard in lieu of the maximum allowable 30.00%. 3. Section 10-5-4(A)4(c) to allow for the reconstruction of an existing attached deck in kind with a corner side yard setback of 8.50 feet in lieu of the minimum required 18.00 feet. 4. Any other zoning relief necessary to construct the project as depicted on the plans presented or revised at the public hearing or at a public meeting of the Village Board.

Mr. Witt stated that the subject property is a corner lot located in the R2 Zoning District at the southeast corner of Crescent Boulevard and Hickory Road. He also stated that the zoning and land use immediately surrounding the subject property is single-family residential and that the notice of public hearing was published in the October 9, 2015 edition of the Daily Herald, was mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property and a placard was placed on the property. Mr. Witt stated that no Village records were found related to the granting of any zoning variations for this property which he stated is of interest because the existing deck that is attached to the house is nonconforming and is within the corner side yard setback.

Mr. Witt displayed copies of site plans for the subject property. He indicated the property owned by the petitioners which is subdivided by a dedicated public way that serves as an alley for access to their garage on the substandard size lot, to the garage on the neighbors' property and subsequently to a third garage. He stated that there have been attempts noted in Village records to get the three property owners to agree to vacate the public way and eliminate the public way behind each of the lots so that they are not subdivided. He added that this street is a dedicated public way and it is not snowplowed by the Village. He also stated that the property owner immediately to the west is not in favor of the vacation of the alley because they need access to the current garage, however, the third neighbor is in favor of the vacation. He added that until all of the homeowners are in favor of vacating the alley, the two lots cannot be combined. Mr. Witt displayed and described a survey of the subject property that included the public way. He stated that the two lots combined are approximately 15,000 square feet which is almost twice the size of the minimum standard. He stated that although it seems as though there is a great deal of space to build a garage, the property is trapezoidal in nature and the front portion of the lot is almost twice the size of the rear. He stated that as one works his way toward the rear and applies the rear yard setback requirement of 40 feet, the area that becomes available for construction of a garage is very small in comparison to the size of the lot which is why they are requesting a variation above the 30% maximum allowable.

Mr. Witt also displayed a drawing indicating the predicament the petitioners are in with regard to the garage. He stated that if the two lots were combined, there would be no front yard setback to deal with or an issue with the lack of a principal structure on the property nor an issue with a substandard sized lot. He added that they are condensing three variations into one by combining the two lots owned by the petitioners. Mr. Witt also displayed a drawing of the garage that could be constructed if they applied the front, side and rear setbacks inside on the substandard piece of the rear lot and the garage would end up being 15 feet deep which is insufficient for a standard car. He then showed the garage that is being proposed. Mr. Witt stated that the third diagram shows the difference between what can be built with regard to the requirement for maintaining the 30% with the rear yard area versus what the petitioners are proposing. He stated that the first diagram shows the area that can be built with regard to the current rear yard requirements and the second diagram is the one proposed that was seen on the previous two diagrams.

Mr. Witt stated that another issue of concern is the petitioners' existing deck for which he stated there is no record of a variation being granted. He displayed the location of the deck and stated that the petitioners would like to reconstruct the deck with two stairs farther out than they currently are.

Questions to Staff from the Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA Member Bourke stated that an attempt was made to vacate the alley and asked if the situation would be resolved with a permanent easement at the same place. Mr. Witt responded yes with regard to the garage, however, agreement from all three property owners would be required.

Petitioners' Presentation

Denise and Aaron Denman, the petitioners, of 817 Crescent Blvd., Glen Ellyn, Illinois and their architect, Sean Gordon, were present to speak on behalf of the proposed project. Mr. Gordon pointed out that their hardship is the pie shape of the lot and he displayed a site plan of the property. He added that if the lot was rectangular in shape, they would be able to build a 660-square foot garage on their property. He stated that the garage and deck are beyond their life span and need to be replaced. He added that they currently cannot park cars in the garage due to its condition. Mr. Gordon stated that the petitioners purchased this home three years ago and are interested in maintaining the character of their home, the 3-lot area and the access to the garage from the alley.

Mr. Denman stated that they knew when they bought the subject property that the garage and deck would need to be repaired at some point in the future. He stated they would like to have a 3-car garage, however, they probably only would be allowed to have a 2-car garage.

Mr. Denman stated that they talked to their neighbors when they first learned of the easement issue. He stated that the middle neighbor would like to retain the right to link her property with the other properties and sell those properties as one entire lot to be built upon, however, the other neighbors are not in agreement. Mr. Denman stated that both neighbors are supportive, however, of their variation requests.

Questions from the Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA Member Constantino asked if the alley with the dedicated easement was not on the property, would they be able to build this structure or a larger structure, and Mr. Gordon responded that they would still need a variation for the lot coverage if it was considered one lot because of the pie shape restriction. Mr. Witt added that because the lot is skinny in the back and trapezoidal in nature, the area allowed for the structure is based on a percentage of the required rear yard. Mr. Witt responded to ZBA Member Constantino that he is not familiar with any other lots in Glen Ellyn with streets running through them like the subject lot and those surrounding it. Mr. Denman responded to ZBA Member Constantino that there is only one tax bill related to the subject property.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Proposed Requests

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

Findings of Fact

ZBA Member Constantino stated that Denise and Aaron Denman, owners of the property at 817 Crescent Boulevard are seeking variations from the Zoning Code to allow the use of two non-contiguous lots owned by the same party to be developed as a zoning lot with a garage on a presently nonconforming lot. He stated the petitioners are also seeking a variation to allow the construction of a 644-square foot detached garage resulting in area equal to approximately 32.56% of the required rear yard in lieu of the maximum allowable 30.00%. He added that the petitioners are seeking a variation to replace an existing deck with an 8-1/2 foot setback in the corner yard with a required minimum of 18.00 feet. Mr. Witt described the lot as a corner lot in an R2 Single Family Residential area. The property has no prior variations although the existing deck is located within a nonconforming area lined within the corner side yard setback. He described the public way that is dedicated similar to an alley that crosses the property approximately two-thirds from the north to the south. He also stated that two to three adjoining neighbors have sought to vacate this public way and create two lots, however, could not agree and such a vacation was not completed.

ZBA Member Constantino stated that the shape of the lot is trapezoidal with the rear yard considered to be a substandard lot. Because of the shape, the allowable area within which a structure could be constructed is reduced. This particular variation request, if granted, would

eliminate the need for three separate variations with two lots not considered contiguous. ZBA Member Constantino stated that as the current lot is configured, the allowable area for construction would be too small to make a legal size garage for use. ZBA Member Constantino stated that no explanation was given for the existing deck as to why permits were issued for the construction of the deck as the plans were submitted as essentially replacing the existing deck.

Architect Sean Gordon emphasized that the pie shape of the lot creates the major hardship and that the lot shape and size reduce the size of the building located on this lot. He stated that the current garage has not been used because of safety issues. Aaron Denman, the owner of the property for approximately three years, stated that the garage has been unsafe and unusable. ZBA Member Constantino stated that the deck is also in disrepair and possibly structurally unsafe. Mr. Denman believes that a two-car garage with storage is the minimum practical use they will be allowed. ZBA Member Constantino stated that the neighbors are generally supportive although did not support the vacation of the drive-thru.

ZBA Member Bourke moved, seconded by ZBA Member Micheli, to accept the findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Comments from the Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA Member LaVanway stated that this is a unique request as the shape of the lot is trapezoidal and it is bifurcated by a public alley. He stated that the neighbors to the west are not amenable to alternative solutions, and he believes that the petitioners' request is modest. ZBA Member Miller stated that he agreed with ZBA Member LaVanway. ZBA Member Micheli agreed with ZBA Members LaVanway and Miller and added that the variations are in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and are a unique situation. ZBA Member Whalls stated that the subject lot is pie shaped and on a corner and added that he could find no reason to deny the variation requests. ZBA Member Constantino agreed with the other ZBA Members' comments and added that these circumstances are unique and that the driveway and the shape of the lot create a hardship. He added that the petitioners are seeking to replace a deck and garage that are in disrepair which is a safety hazard. ZBA Member Bourke stated that he totally agrees that this is a very unique situation and it was very easy to vote in favor of their requests. He also stated that if the Village vacated a piece of the alley to the petitioners, they would be within their rights to give the easement to the people further along the alley. ZBA Member Bourke also stated that the petitioners are being penalized at the rear of their property for the roundabout at the front end of their property.

ZBA Member Bourke moved, seconded by ZBA Member Whalls, to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Motion

ZBA Member Miller moved, seconded by ZBA Member Constantino, that after considering the application of Denise and Aaron Denman, for the property at 817 Crescent Boulevard, they recommend approval of the variation requests due to the unique circumstances that the property is divided into two non-contiguous lots and is a trapezoidal shape. He added that without a variation, the garage could only be built under the current situation and both the deck and the garage need to be replaced.

The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) yes votes as follows: ZBA Members Miller, Constantino, Bourke, LaVanway, Micheli, Whalls and Chairperson Garrity voted yes.

Trustee Report

Trustee Liaison Ladesic stated it is currently budget time at the Village.

Chairperson Report

Chairperson Garrity thanked some Glenbard West students for attending this meeting.

Staff Report

Building and Zoning Official Steve Witt stated that the next ZBA meeting will be cancelled.

ZBA Member LaVanway moved, seconded by ZBA Member Bourke, to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Submitted by:

Barbara Utterback
Recording Secretary

Steve Witt
Building and Zoning Official