



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 • DECEMBER 11, 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 Luszcak	Commissioner	Present	
Theodore McGinn	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Present	
James Dittrich	Commissioner	Present	
John Pirog	Commissioner	Absent	

STaff present: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Nov 27, 2018 7:00 PM

Mr. Larson made a motion to approve the minutes of November 27, 2018; seconded by Mr. Luszcak.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Brent Larson, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jerry Luszcak, Commissioner
AYES:	Larson, Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszcak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich
ABSENT:	Pirog

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 214 S Greeley Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on November 26, 2018 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. Topographical Map
5. Site Plan
6. Elevations
7. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioners: Mr. Kendal Yeager

Mr. Yeager stated they bought the home over a year ago and noticed the garage was badly damaged and leaning. He stated it was in disrepair on the inside and the foundation had large cracks. Mr. Yeager stated he wants to tear down and replace it with a larger garage in the approx. same location. He explained it will still be a 2 car garage just slightly larger for storage.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview of the request stating the property is zoned R-2. She stated they are looking to replace an existing garage with a new one that is approx. 170 square feet larger. She spoke to Village code on accessory structures in the flood plain and how they require a special use. Ms. Bremanis referred to the slide to show the location pointing out the amount of garage in flood plain will not be changing. She spoke to the height which meets code and pointed out the new structure will put them at maximum lot coverage. She referred to the slides to show existing conditions.

Mr. McGinn asked if they spoke to neighbors at 210 and 220 S Greeley.
Mr. Yeager answered yes and they did not have any issues

Mr. McGinn asked if there are any issues with flooding.
Mr. Yeager answered no not on their property. He spoke to the storm when they first moved in where his property did not flood but others did.

Ms. Wood asked when that storm was.
Mr. Yeager answered around October 2017

Ms. Wood asked if engineering had any complaints
Ms. Bremanis answered no engineering or building reviewed and did not have any concerns. She pointed out it meets setbacks.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked staff if any other properties in the flood plain at max

coverage

Ms. Bremanis stated she is not aware but clarified they are only changing lot coverage by 1.5%.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

While the floodplain encumbers a section of the proposed detached garage, the Village Engineer has reviewed this proposal and does not have any specific concerns regarding its replacement. Additionally, the Petitioner is replacing an existing detached garage that is in current disrepair and not increasing the square footage in the flood plain. In addition, the lot coverage will still meet code. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the proposed Special Use, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Special Use shall substantially conform to the site plan and elevations submitted by the Contractor, on 10/08/2018 except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

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

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Dittrich stated it meets requirements for Special Use especially with safety and welfare with the current structure tilting. He pointed out they are not expanding in the area already in flood plain so moves to approve.

Ms. Wood agreed with Mr. Dittrich the importance of the area in the flood plain is not expanding.

Ms. Roth-Wurster pointed out from the aerial there are other properties with garages in the back along the creek

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0. This item will go to Village Council either on January 14th or January 24, 2018.

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

2. 652 N Quentin Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on November 26, 2018 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. Site Plans
5. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioners Mr. John Wrzesinski 652 N Quentin

Mr. John Silva 105 Westview St Hoffman Estates contractor

Mr. Wrzesinski stated he would like to put an addition on the back. He stated when he bought the property he thought it was in unincorporated Palatine. He stated he runs a window company and pulls permits in Palatine all the time.

Ms. Wood asked for more information specifically for the accessory structures, side lot lines and total square footage of the driveway and address the standards. Mr. Wrzesinski explained he will be in conformity with driveway width at the lot line once he reduces the parking space to get it off the line.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview of the request. She referred to the slide of the aerial comparison to show the work that had been done. She referred to the existing conditions slides to show the work that was discovered from a complaint the Village received and how close the addition is to the lot line. Ms. Bremanis referred to the detailed site plan to show what is staying and what they are removing. She pointed out once they remove the pavement on the driveway they will be meeting code at the lot line but explained the variation for the driveway is for the width. She spoke to what is included in the accessory structure square footage including the shed, canopies, and existing garage referring to the existing condition slides to show what will be removed and what will remain.

Ms. Wood asked about the need for the driveway and the canopies.

Mr. Silva explained the reason for the car pad is because of Quentin being dangerous to just back out onto. He spoke to the road when they plow there is no way to see oncoming traffic. He stated to be able to back into parking pad and pull out forward would be much safer. He spoke to other neighbors that have parking pads. Mr. Silva stated he hopes if nothing else gets approved he hopes the board will approve the parking pad.

Ms. Wood asked about the canopies being accessory structures

Ms. Bremanis explained anything over 16 inches in height that not connected to the home would fall into that category.

Ms. Wood asked what is below the two canopies that will remain.

Mr. Silva referred to the existing condition slide explaining there is a wooden deck below the one to the left. He stated the canopy to the right is smaller and is for shade to keep the home cooler

Ms. Wood asked if there are pavers under the canopy
Mr. Silva answered yes brick pavers

Ms. Wood clarified the accessory structures include the two canopies, shed and the garage, which equals the 1022 square feet.
Ms. Bremanis answered yes referring to the detailed site plan stating it does not include the canopy shown with the blue square in front of garage.

Ms. Wood asked if staff knows what the square footage of the shed and garage is.
Ms. Bremanis answered 697square feet combined.

Ms. Wood clarified without the canopies they would just make it
Ms. Bremanis answered yes

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if in terms of lot coverage is the 2490 current of with the removed section.
Ms. Bremanis explained that is with things removed.

Ms. Wood clarified the building coverage is ok just the lot coverage is being looked at.
Ms. Bremanis answered correct the lot coverage is at approx. 48%.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified the 48% is with the boxes removed
Ms. Bremanis answered correct explaining it is with all blue boxes removed would be higher if they were not removing.

Mr. Luszczak clarified removing the canopies doesn't make a difference unless they remove the pavers.
Ms. Bremanis explained removing the canopies is lowering the accessory structure relief but will not affect the lot coverage.

Ms. Wood asked if they looked for additional homes in the neighborhood with turnarounds on Quentin
Mr. Silva stated most have a single driveway

Mr. Cavanaugh asked with driveway reduced will there be enough for a turnaround.
Mr. Silva referred to the aerial to show the 2 properties below both have turnarounds.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked the petitioners if they feel the driveway will be safe and usable for turnaround with the area removed.
Ms. Bremanis pointed out with the removal it will be close to the way it was.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if they think it will be safe at the 2013 level

Mr. Silva answered yes referring to the detailed site plan to show the proposed plan and how they can turn around on pad.

Ms. Bremanis pointed out the pad is approximately 20ft. wide.

Ms. Wood asked if the driveway will be same as when they moved in once they remove the pavement area.

Mr. Wrzesinski stated it will be just about the same

Ms. Wood asked if the driveway was asphalt when they purchased the home.

Mr. Silva stated it was asphalt .

Ms. Wood clarified they repaved and added additional

Mr. Wrzesinski answered yes

Ms. Wood clarified if they remove that area it would be close to what it was at time of purchase.

Mr. Wrzesinski answered yes

Ms. Bremanis clarified if they had come in for a permit to remove and replace it would have been permitted but since the work was done without a permit and we don't have the measurements they are required to get relief for everything that doesn't meet code.

Mr. Silva driveway is further south by 2 feet. He pointed out they removed the concrete sidewalk and replaced with asphalt.

Ms. Bremanis referred to the existing conditions slide to show the area Mr. Silva is referring to pointing out they paved all the way to the house.

Mr. Luszczak asked why they needed to expand if they were using it as a turnaround before.

Mr. Wrzesinski explained it was in terrible shape so he was fixing it and didn't think it was a big deal to add an additional parking spot.

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked what the purpose of the sunroom is

Mr. Wrzesinski stated it will be used for a spa

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked with the area being removed would it be aligned with the south side.

Mr. Wrzesinski answered yes

Ms. Roth-Wurster asked staff if the addition would be required to have the same siding as the rest of the house.

Ms. Bremanis answered no but explained they will be required to get a building permit and will need to meet those requirements.

Ms. Wood asked if it is going to be a 3 season room

Mr. Wrzesinski answered yes.

Mr. Dittrich asked if the utilities have signed off on the shed
Mr. Silva stated he is currently speaking to the utility companies who thus far have no concerns.

Ms. Wood asked if the garage was not conforming at 3ft from the side
Ms. Bremanis answered yes explaining a 5ft setback is required.

Ms. Wood asked why not take more of the driveway width out.
Mr. Silva referred to pic of existing conditions showing the car on the pad. He pointed out how it would not fit if shorter explaining another car backing out would clip it.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the pad would be used for parking or just a turnaround
Mr. Wrzesinski answered both

Mr. Luszczyk how many cars are parked there
Mr. Wrzesinski stated the home is unoccupied so there won't be a lot of cars there.
Mr. Silva explained no one lives there sometimes so generally there are not a lot of cars parked out in front. He further explained they may meet there for BBQ on the weekend but generally there are no cars.

Ms. Wood asked if someone will be living there.
Mr. Wrzesinski stated maybe he will retire there but his primary residence is in LaGrange Park which is where he works out of.
Mr. Silva explained it is his investment
Mr. Wrzesinski stated he has fixed it up nice for the neighbors. He apologized doing the work without a permit explaining he thought he was in an unincorporated area.

Ms. Wood asked staff when the property was incorporated.
Ms. Bremanis stated in the early 90's
Mr. Silva stated it had to be after 91 because the previous owner pulled permits from the County
Mr. Cavanaugh stated the application says it was annexed in 1991.

Mr. Silva stated as a marine he appreciates the Toys for Tots.

Ms. Bremanis stated Community Services and Engineering have reviewed and have not identified any issues. She stated all work will be required to go through the permitting process if approved by the Village Council.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the complaint was.
Ms. Bremanis stated it was for the addition that was built that encroached into the property line. She further explained once that complaint came on and an inspector went out to check it out the rest of the work was discovered.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The petitioner obtained a new plat of survey showing the existing conditions, which includes the work completed without a permit. The Petitioner is proposing to remove the following: 1) a section of the house addition that encroaches into the required side yard setback; 2) a section of pavement to reduce the existing driveway width to meet the 25-foot maximum allowable width at the lot line; and, 3) the carport located in front of the garage. A stop work order and citations were issued for these violations. The adjudication process is being managed separately from this process. The Petitioner has applied for the necessary building permits, which are now under review.

While the encroachment of the garage into the required side yard setback is an existing condition, the Petitioner removed a substandard addition at the rear of the garage without a permit in order to revert it back to its original footprint. Thus, a Variation is required. The garage location has not changed and the improvements should not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

The previous shed was located in the easement; however, the Zoning Ordinance requires the Petitioner to seek zoning relief to permit a new structure (shed) in an easement.

Lastly, once the Petitioner removes the section of the house addition encroaching in the required setback, the house addition will meet the required setbacks per the Zoning Ordinance. However, the house addition is a component of the lot coverage calculations, which requires a Variation.

Ultimately, the Village is not able to assess the impact of the Code related non-conformities and any legally non-conforming statuses due to the work complete without a permit. The Petitioner indicates that some of the improvements were also made prior to the current owner purchasing the property. The appropriate process step is to seek the necessary relief from the Code, based upon the current condition of the property. Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion for the requested variations. If the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends approval, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Variations shall substantially conform to the site plan prepared by the Architect, John Kevin A. Panek Architect LLC dated 11/2/18, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Ms. Wood clarified with removing the driveway it is okay at the property line but the variation is for the width.

Ms. Bremanis answered correct and explained the code.

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

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to approve the driveway width

Ms. Wood stated she would like to take all the variations together if possible.

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh stated he is torn because there is a lot going on. He stated the easiest thing to do is to approve them and make them go through the building permit process to get the property where it needs to be.

Ms. Wood stated living on Quentin she can attest to what they are saying about it being a busy road with many lanes. She stated all of her neighbors have turnarounds. She stated when the snow comes Cook county does plow somewhat recklessly. Ms. Wood stated when she can't use her turn around it is difficult to navigate so understands the need for the turnaround. Ms. Wood spoke to the square footage being a lot over and how she doesn't see an issue unless there is flooding issues. She stated the house is maintained. Ms. Wood spoke to the driveway being nonconforming when purchased as well as the garage and shed not being new. She stated she is unsure if the lot coverage of 48% is a result of anything new.

Ms. Bremanis stated the addition on back increased it.

Ms. Wood stated that brings it up 3% not 10%. She stated it looks like a lot but thinks it is just at the point for her to be in favor

Mr. Larson stated he looks at this as if it was not built yet and is having a hard time with it meeting the standards for a variation. He stated some of them yes but some no so when put together he doesn't think he can be in favor.

Ms. Wood asked what ones if he in favor of.

Mr. Larson stated the garage and driveway

Mr. Luszcak agreed with Mr. Larson and stated he is okay with the shed if they get sign off from utilities as well.

Mr. Larson agreed with Mr. Luszcak.

Mr. Luszcak stated he has a problem with the lot coverage

Ms. Wood stated that is with the addition. She asked Mr. Luszcak asked about the accessory structures.

Mr. Luszcak stated he looks more at total lot coverage. He stated the shed and garage are fine.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated they are looking at a lot. She stated the driveway makes sense on Quentin but agrees that lot coverage is a concern. Ms. Roth-Wurster stated she looks at it as not only accessory structure but also necessary structure. She stated she sees the driveway and garage as things that need to be there. She stated she hasn't seen a lot of explanation to address the standards.

Mr. Luszczyk asked if the addition was out of the equation what would the lot coverage be.

Ms. Bremanis doesn't have math but clarified if everything was approved other than lot coverage the addition once the section is removed meets setbacks and height so they could choose how to get it back to 45%.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was approved by a vote of 5-2. This item will go to Village Council on either January 14 or January 24, 2018.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [5 TO 2]
MOVER:	Kevin Cavanaugh, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Jan Wood, Commissioner
AYES:	Roth-Wurster, Wood, Luszczyk, McGinn, Cavanaugh
NAYS:	Larson, Dittrich
ABSENT:	Pirog

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

Both 1299 N Arbor Lane and 235 W Northwest Highway were approved at the Village Council. The December 26th ZBA meeting has been cancelled. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 8, 2019.

V. ADJOURNMENT

1. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

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

2. Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Dittrich made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurtser.

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

