



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

VILLAGE HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS 200 E. WOOD STREET
PALATINE, IL 60067-5339 – (847) 359-9050
<http://www.palatine.il.us>

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MINUTES • JANUARY 9, 2018

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Brent Larson	Commissioner	Present	
Cindy Roth-Wurster	Commissioner	Present	
Jan Wood	Commissioner	Present	
Jerry Luszczyk	Commissioner	Present	
Theodore McGinn	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Present	
James Dittrich	Commissioner	Present	
John Pirog	Commissioner	Present	

Staff present: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

II. MINUTES APPROVAL

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Dec 12, 2017 7:00 PM

Mr. Cavanaugh made a motion to approve the minutes of December 12, 2017; seconded by Mr. Dittrich.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	James Dittrich, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczyk, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog

III. CASE STAFF STATEMENTS**1. 217 N. Benton Street**

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on December 25, 2017 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

- 1. Application for Variation**
- 2. Proof of Ownership**
- 3. Plat of Survey**
- 4. Site Plans**
- 5. Elevations**
- 6. Neighboring Property Owner Statements**
- 7. Public Notice**

Sworn in staff: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

Ms. Bremanis gave the background of the request. The Petitioner replaced the second story over the existing first floor. The proposed design will include a canopy over the entrance including the stoop and stairs. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

- **Variation to permit a canopy to encroach 6 feet into the required front yard.**

SITE ANALYSIS:

- The Subject Property is zoned R-2 Single Family. The existing residence has a legally non-conforming front yard setback at approximately 27 feet, instead of the minimum required 30 feet.
- The Petitioners replaced the existing second floor with a higher roof line through the issuance of a building permit. The replaced second story includes dormer windows, which are set back from the legally non-conforming front yard for the principal structure and was approved through a building permit.
- A second component of the planned residential improvements requires relief from the Zoning Ordinance. The Petitioners would also like to install a new canopy that will encroach 9 feet into the required front yard.
- Per code, canopies can encroach 3 feet into the front yard. In this instance, the established front yard is approximately 27 feet. As the proposed canopy encroaches 9 feet into that yard, the required relief is 6 feet or a front yard setback of 18 feet.
- Both building and lot coverage meet code.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS:

Community Services	No Issues Identified
Engineering	No Issues Identified
Environmental	N/A

Health	
Fire Prevention	N/A
Public Works	N/A
Police	N/A

STANDARDS FOR A VARIATION: Standards for a Variation are found in Section 14.03 D (1) and (2) of the Zoning Code. Specifically, the Petitioners must show that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located; that the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances; and that the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality. The Petition for Variation is attached, and the Petitioners have attempted to address the required standards.

Ms. Wood asked if there are any questions on Staff's presentation.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked how many homes in the area have similar encroachments

Ms. Bremanis explained the majority of homes appear not to meet setback.

Sworn in Petitioner - Mr. Charles Rowley, 217 N. Benton Street, Palatine

Mr. Rowley explained he and his wife feel it conforms to the neighborhood since a lot of the homes have front porches or canopies. He spoke to the neighboring properties having similar encroachments. Mr. Rowley explained he is trying to add to the 2nd story they are already adding. He stated he has always envisioned having a front canopy and hoping to do so at this time.

Ms. Wood asked if any other questions for Petitioner. There were no further questions for the Petitioner.

Sworn in Mr. Robert Duer 208 N. Benton Street, Palatine

Mr. Duer stated he is in support of the petitioner. He explained they live in the inner city of Palatine, which is not in conformance with current codes. He stated the petitioner is enhancing the neighborhood and restated he is in complete support.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are proposing to install a canopy that will encroach into the front yard setback. The first floor principal structure is existing non-conforming and the proposed canopy will encroach farther into the required front yard. The addition of the canopy should not impact the surrounding property owners or alter the essential character of the neighborhood. In advance applying for this relief, the Petitioners submitted sign-off approvals from the 5 immediately adjacent surrounding property owners indicating their support of the requested relief. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Variation subject to the following condition:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevation plan

prepared by Warren Johnson Architects, Inc dated 11/16/2017 except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked if there were any questions on Staff's recommendation.

Ms. Wood asked what the setbacks used to be.

Ms. Bremanis stated the house is old and was built before the current R2 standards were in place.

Ms. Wood clarified her question was what the setbacks were when the home was built.

Ms. Bremanis explained back in 1966 they were still at 30 ft. but prior to that it is unknown.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Cavanaugh made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh stated the request is pretty straightforward. He pointed out the request will make the home more conforming to the immediate neighborhood.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated the standards have been met. She pointed out the reasonable return standard can be argued but the request indicates in climate weather it will add to the property.

Ms. Wood spoke to the home's uniqueness being because of when the home was built any updates would require some kind of relief. She pointed out the request is not overwhelming and is adding to architectural beauty and functionality.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request had met the standards and was approved by a unanimous vote of 8-0. This item will go to Village Council on January 15, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog

2. 225 W. Kenilworth Avenue

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on December 25, 2017 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application for Special Use**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Plans- site plan, floor plans, & elevations**
5. **Public Notice**

Ms. Bremanis gave the background of the request. The Petitioners are proposing to construct an addition over an existing structure and extend the footprint that currently encroaches into the side yard setbacks. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

- **Special Use to permit an addition to be setback 5 feet from the side lot lines instead of the required 10 feet.**

SITE ANALYSIS:

- The Subject Property is zoned R-2 Single Family. The existing residence is legally non-conforming for both of the interior side yard required setbacks, at approximately 5 feet instead of the minimum required 10 feet.
- The Petitioner is proposing to build an addition that would align with the existing structure and maintain the existing approximately 5 foot side yard from both side property lines towards the rear of the property. They are also proposing a portico over the entrance that meets the setback requirements.
- The peak height meets code.
- Both building and lot coverage meet code.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS:

Community Services	No Issues Identified
Engineering	No Issues Identified
Environmental Health	N/A
Fire Prevention	N/A
Public Works	N/A
Police	N/A

STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL USE: Since this Petition is not for a use publicly operated or traditionally affected with the public interest, those standards under Section 14.05 D (2) and (3) are applicable. Specifically, the Petitioners must show that the Special Use, if granted, will be operated in a manner consistent

with the public health, safety, and welfare, and that the Special Use will not have a negative impact on the value of surrounding properties. The Petition for a Special Use is attached, and the Petitioners have attempted to address the required standards.

Ms. Wood asked if there are any questions on Staff's presentation.

Mr. Pirog asked if they currently have a Special Use for the 5 ft.

Ms. Bremanis explained the home was built with the existing condition of the 5ft setback but the code now requires 10ft.

Sworn in petitioner - Ms. Monique DeSalvo 225 W. Kenilworth Avenue, Palatine

Ms. DeSalvo stated she purchased the home a few months ago. She explained she would like to have a 2 car garage to fit both their vehicles into and the only way to do it is to go back. She pointed out with a 10 ft. setback this wouldn't work because they have to follow the existing lines of the house. Ms. DeSalvo explained the addition on the other side of the home will include a master bedroom, an on suite, a walk in closet and an art studio which also will have to follow the existing lot lines.

Ms. Roth-Wurster clarified the garage addition will use the same roof line and the new studio will have a similar roof line not adding a second story.

Monique explained that is correct for the studio but the bedroom will add an extension to the two stories.

Mr. Pirog asked if the garage addition will be like a drive through.

Ms. DeSalvo explained the garage will be a shotgun or tandem garage by extending the current garage 15 ft. back. She explained they will have to tear up an existing patio to add the garage

Sworn in Mr. Tom Hans 219 W. Kenilworth Avenue, Palatine

Mr. Hans stated he has been in the property since June 2017. He expressed his concern is with the site lines and sun exposure since his deck is fairly close to the lot line.

Mr. Larson asked where his deck is located.

Mr. Hans explained referring to the existing conditions slide.

Mr. Pirog asked if the current site line is the backyard.

Mr. Hans answered yes.

Mr. Pirog asked if the addition will come closer to his property

Mr. Hans stated no their addition is following their existing house line. He explained his concern is with the new height and the site lines.

Sworn in Mr. Thomas Buckley, architect, 5928 Eaton Drive Hoffman Estates, IL

Mr. Buckley explained the studio is approximately 15ft tall and would block some of the western sun.

Mr. Hans stated he doesn't wasn't to be a bad neighbor and impede on them in their studio.

Mr. Buckley explained they have awning windows in the studio that are set 8ft. high so it shouldn't be a problem. He further explained the master will have a window facing the east but will most likely have curtains or blinds and the window below will be to a laundry room.

Mr. Pirog clarified the concern is more with the view from the deck being the side of a house not so much with the sun.

Mr. Hans stated he wishes he had time to sit and speak to them to discuss the plans and his concerns.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the tree will be removed.

Mr. Buckley stated they will make every effort to keep it but it most likely not survive.

Mr. Larson asked if Mr. Buckley can show the location of the addition relative to the deck.

Ms. Bremanis asked how close the addition will go to the tree.

Mr. Buckley stated approximately 10ft.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the landscaping between the two properties will also be removed.

Mr. Buckley stated at this moment they are not removing.

Mr. Hans stated he believes the landscaping in question is on his property.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the rear setback is still under code.

Ms. Bremanis stated that is correct. She explained if they did an addition off the back and were 10ft off the side lot line they would not require this relief.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified there is no issues with lot coverage.

Ms. Bremanis stated that is correct.

Mr. Larson asked if there is a way to do the addition and meet the 10ft. setback.

Mr. Buckley stated no because they would have to take a 5ft. hit out of the master bedroom. He explained they purchased the home because of the 1950's retro roofline and would like to enhance the home while maintaining the existing rooflines as best they can.

Ms. Bremanis pointed you can get a better idea of where the deck is if zoom on the aerial

Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the square footage of the deck.

Mr. Hans stated it is approximately 30x17.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked how far out the new addition will come out.

Mr. Buckley stated 30ft.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated the addition will mirror the deck
Discussion on the location of the addition relevant to the deck.

Mr. Pirog clarified Mr. Hans newly purchased this home a year ago.
Mr. Hans stated in June 2017.

Mr. Pirog pointed out it is the only house in the area with a deck in the side yard instead of the back. He asked if that is where the doors are.
Mr. Hans explained that is considered the back of the property with his front door being on Hart.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the deck is nonconforming.
Ms. Bremanis stated she does not know the width of the property and explained the code and how it relates.

Ms. Wood asked if any other questions for Petitioner. There were no further questions for the Petitioner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are proposing to build an addition over the existing house and extend the footprint to the south, which will encroach into the required side yard setbacks. The residence is existing non-conforming and the proposed addition will not change the existing setbacks. Furthermore, this addition should not impact the surrounding property owners or alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevation plan prepared by Thomas Buckley Architect dated 12/4/2017 except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked if there were any questions on Staff's recommendation.
There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Larson stated with the house having an existing 5 foot setback he does not feel the additional set back 5 feet for a 10 foot (meeting code) would make a difference.

Ms. Roth-Wurster addressed the standards stating it won't have a negative impact on the surrounding properties. She pointed out the impact on the neighbor using his deck is unfortunate because of how things are situated but with landscaping it could possibly be worked out.

Mr. Pirog disagreed with Mr. Larson and Ms. Roth-Wurster. He feels it will completely block the sun and make it feel like living in Chicago with the house blocking the neighbors entire patio. He stated in doing this will impact the value of the neighbor's house.

Mr. Cavanaugh stated he initially agreed with Mr. Pirog but the peak height of the addition will only be 8-10 ft. and with the deck being 2ft off the ground it should not have too big of an affect.

Discussion on the peak height of the studio

Mr. Larson pointed out the Special Use is for the 5ft relief so even if they did the addition to code the neighbor would still be looking at the side of a house.

Ms. Roth-Wurster pointed out the difficult circumstances with having a corner lot is not knowing where the deck or the garage will be placed. She pointed out sometimes people put up a 6ft fence and that would be what you would be looking at. She stated they are just trying to extend their home and make it more livable.

The motion failed.

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to deny; seconded by Mr. Pirog.

Mr. Buckley asked if the item can be continued.

Ms. Wood explained they will still have to go to council and will have time before that meeting to review.

Ms. Bremanis stated if there are conversations that need to be had no village council date will be set.

Ms. Wood explained the motion is just a recommendation to council.

Mr. Buckley asked if they can reapply immediately if it fails.

Ms. Bremanis explained if denied at the Village Council level they would have to wait a year to reapply. She suggested to finish the vote that has started and then reconvene with the petitioner and the neighbor and staff can decide where to go from there.

Mr. Larson pointed out if the zoning board votes to deny there is a higher threshold for the Village Council.

Discussion on what happens if denied.

Discussion on the possibility of continuing.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request was denied by a vote of 5-3. This item will go to Village Council in February.

RESULT:	RECOMMEND TO DENY [5 TO 3]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	John Pirog, Commissioner
AYES:	Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog
NAYS:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood

3. 108 N. Forest Avenue

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on December 25, 2017 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application for Special Use**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Plans- site plan, floor plans, & elevations**
5. **Public Notice**

Ms. Bremanis gave the background of the request. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a second story addition over an existing structure that currently encroaches on the rear yard setback. Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting approval of the following:

- **Special Use to permit an addition to be setback 7 feet from the rear lot line instead of the required 40 feet.**

SITE ANALYSIS:

- The Subject Property is zoned R-2 Single Family Residential. The residence has an existing legally non-conforming rear yard setback of approximately 7 feet. The current minimum required rear yard setback in the R-2 District is 40 feet.
- The Petitioner is proposing to build a second story addition over the existing first story. The footprint will be expanded to include a garage addition; however, the garage addition meets the setback requirements.
- The peak height of the addition meets code. Both building and lot coverage meet code.
- The existing 7 foot rear yard setback will be maintained with the second story addition and therefore a setback reduction is required.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS:

Community Services	No Issues Identified
Engineering	No Issues Identified
Environmental Health	N/A
Fire Prevention	N/A
Public Works	N/A
Police	N/A

STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL USE: Since this Petition is not for a use publicly operated or traditionally affected with the public interest, those standards under Section 14.05 D (2) and (3) are applicable. Specifically, the Petitioners must show that the Special Use, if granted, will be operated in a manner consistent

with the public health, safety, and welfare, and that the Special Use will not have a negative impact on the value of surrounding properties. The Petition for a Special Use is attached, and the Petitioners have attempted to address the required standards.

Ms. Wood asked if there are any questions on Staff's presentation.

Mr. Pirog asked if they are adding a new driveway
Ms. Bremanis explained they are expanding driveway

Ms. Wood clarified the relief in review is the 7ft in the rear.
Ms. Bremanis stated that is correct

Ms. Wood asked if any other questions for Petitioner. There were no further questions for the Petitioner.

Sworn in Mr. Jerry Pysz 611 Ellis Drive, Northbrook

Mr. Pysz stated he bought the home a few months ago because it is a nice neighborhood. He stated the house is small and the neighborhood has nice larger homes so would like to add a second story and expand to a 2 car garage. Mr. Pysz spoke to the side yard being his back yard which causes them to require he relief. He stated they want to build the 2nd floor within the same footprint of the existing house.

Mr. Luszczyk asked what the setback would be if it was not a corner lot.
Ms. Bremanis explained it would be 10 ft. and would still be non-conforming.

Mr. Luszczyk asked why the address is still on Forest Avenue.
Ms. Bremanis explained the original layout of the lots and how the property was subdivided which changed the front yards. She stated she is unaware of the history of why it is addressed on Forest Avenue.

Mr. Pirog clarified the request is to build an addition in the same 7ft setback of the existing home.
Ms. Bremanis stated that is correct.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if he has spoken to the neighbors
Mr. Pysz stated he talked to the neighbors next door on Wilson who was happy about them updating the house because it is the sore toe in the neighborhood. He pointed home this will be a big improvement to the neighborhood since there are larger homes next to them.

Mr. McGinn asked about the neighbor at 114 N Forest Avenue.
Mr. Pysz stated they have not talked to them.

Sworn in Mr. Chris Olson 39 N. Forest Avenue, Palatine

Mr. Olson stated he fully supports the request because it makes total sense. He stated he likes to see the house come in as a two story house. He pointed out

there recently has been 2 new homes down the street. Mr. Olson stated his only caution is Forest has a hard 40 ft. building lot line and he nor the neighbors have not been able to build within that line. He pointed out in the drawings there is a porch encroachment into that line.

Discussion on the location of the building line

Ms. Bremanis stated the line was brought to her attention yesterday. She explained in her research into the resubdivision the building line is not shown. Ms. Bremanis stated she has spoken to the petitioner and he is aware if there is a building line he would need to go through a special use process to go through with his current porch plans, which is not the subject of the request relief.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are proposing to build a second story addition that encroaches into the required rear yard setback. The existing residence is legally non-conforming and the proposed addition will not alter the existing setbacks. Furthermore, this addition should not impact the surrounding property owners or alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following condition:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevation plan prepared by EKI Architects dated 11/20/2017 except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked if there were any questions on Staff's recommendation. There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Mr. Cavanaugh.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Luszczak stated the request meets the standards. He pointed out the weird division of the lot creates unique circumstances and he has endorsement from neighbor.

Mr. McGinn stated there will be no adverse impact on neighboring properties

Mr. Cavanagh pointed out although the aerial shows it is close to the property to the north it appears to abut the garage and should not affect the views or site lines of the property.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request had met the standards and was approved by a unanimous vote of 8-0. This item will go to Village Council on January 15, 2018

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	James Dittrich, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczyk, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog

4. 231 N. Northwest Highway

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on December 25, 2017 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. **Application for Special Use**
2. **Proof of Ownership**
3. **Plat of Survey**
4. **Business Plan**
5. **Plans- floor plans & elevations**
6. **Public Notice**

Ms. Bremanis gave the background of the request. The petitioner is seeking a Special Use to permit a medical office (chiropractor) at 231 N. Northwest Highway. Therefore, the Petitioner is seeking approval of the following:

- **Special Use to permit a Medical Office (Chiropractor)**

SITE ANALYSIS:

- The Subject Property is zoned B-2 General Business.
- This is currently Bea's Hair Design and is approximately 1800 square feet.
- Staff will include 6 employees, 1 full-time doctor, 1 massage therapist and 4 support staff.
- Business hours will be 9 AM - 7 PM Monday through Friday. The business plan anticipates approximately 20-30 clients per day, with peak times of 10 AM - 11 AM and 6 PM - 7 PM.
- 6 parking spaces would be required per the 1 parking space per 300 square feet standard. The subject property has 27 spaces.

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS:

Community Services	Upgrade exterior site to provide proper access through the building permit review process.
Engineering	No issues identified
Environmental Health	N/A
Fire Prevention	No issues identified
Public Works	N/A
Police	N/A

STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL USE: Since this Petition is not for a use publicly operated or traditionally affected with the public interest, those standards under Section 14.05 D (2) and (3) are applicable. Specifically, the Petitioners must show that the Special Use, if granted, will be operated in a manner consistent with the public health, safety, and welfare, and that the Special Use will not have a negative impact on the value of surrounding properties. The Petition for a

Special Use is attached, and the Petitioners have attempted to address the required standards.

Ms. Wood asked if there are any questions on Staff's presentation.

Mr. Pirog asked if 231 and 235 are separate lots
Ms. Bremanis clarified in aerial that they are separate.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what is ratio to number of parking spots/ handicap
Ms. Bremanis explained per square footage of the building.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if it is different being a medical office
Ms. Bremanis no not that she is aware

Sworn in Mr. Kevin Coyne- 1001 Warrenville Road Suite 500, Lisle, IL 60532
Mr. Coyne stated he is representing the petitioner. He explained the petitioner has been operating in Elmhurst and hopes to open location here in Palatine. He further explained they are seeking a Special Use to bring a use that is a benefit to the neighboring properties. He stated it will benefit retail and public health and will have no injuries to the neighborhood being a quiet use and ample parking. Mr. Coyne stated they are excited to bring the use to Palatine.

Ms. Wood asked if any other questions for Petitioner. There were no further questions for the Petitioner.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed use should not have any negative impact on the neighboring businesses and Northwest Highway commercial corridor. Also, medical offices are contemplated as Special Uses within the business districts. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the business plan submitted by the Petitioner, Illinois Spine Care, on 12/08/2017 and floor plan dated 10/30/17, except as such plans may be revised to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood asked if there were any questions on Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked about the exterior work mentioned.
Ms. Bremanis explained that was mentioned by the building department but they were not specific.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified that it was nothing substantial.
Ms. Bremanis confirmed this question.

Mr. Coyne pointed out there will be a handicap ramp added as part of the build out.

There were no further questions. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Larson addressed the standards pointing out it won't have a negative impact on the surrounding properties and will operate in a manner consistent with public health safety and welfare. He pointed out the volume will be similar to the hair salon.

Mr. Luszczak stated the area is starting to come to life again and thinks this use is a good fit.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request had met the standards and was approved by a unanimous vote of 8-0. This item will go to Village Council on January 15, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Brent Larson, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Cindy Roth-Wurster, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Bremanis stated there were 3 items on next meeting's agenda; however, 1 of the items has to be continued because the Petitioner did not meet the public notice deadline.

Ms. Bremanis stated the church at 755 S. Benton Street has been continued to the February 5th Village Council meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT**1. Motion to Adjourn**

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Larson.

RESULT:	MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	James Dittrich, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Brent Larson, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczyk, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich, Pirog

