



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 • OCTOBER 13, 2020

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 Luszczak	Commissioner	Present	
Theodore McGinn	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Cavanaugh	Commissioner	Present	
James Dittrich	Commissioner	Present	
John Pirog	Commissioner	Present	

Staff present: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Zoning Board of Appeals - Regular Meeting - Sep 9, 2020 7:00 PM

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

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 90 E. Benton Court

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 28, 2020 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Variation
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Site Plan
4. Fence Elevation
5. Public Notice

Sworn in staff: Ms. Lyn Bremanis

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. Edward Barbour 90 E Benton Court owner

Mr. Barbour explained they want to replace the fence on western edge of border. He stated currently there is a 6ft fence that has storm damage. He referred to the aerial slide to show location. Mr. Barbour stated he shares the border with a commercial property (Donkey Inn). He pointed out Donkey Inn has an 8ft fence along their northern border so this would be a continuation of their 8ft fence. He stated the request is for sound and privacy reasons.

Mr. Pirog asked how long the 6ft fence has been there.

Mr. Barbour stated it has been there before he purchased the home, according to the previous owner sometime between 2004-2008.

Mr. Pirog asked if the noise has increased recently.

Mr. Barbour answered no has been better. He explained he has to replace since the fence was damaged in the storm so thinks it would be right time to ask for an 8ft. variance.

Mr. Pirog asked if Donkey Inn has live music.

Mr. Barbour answered no..

Mr. Pirog asked if Donkey Inn has outdoor seating.

Mr. Barbour answered yes but not on that side. He explained the noise is from traffic and parking.

Ms. Roth-Wurster clarified 8 ft. is at highest point asking if the fence would be arched like slide.

Mr. Barbour answered the fence will be continuous level 8ft fence.

Mr. McGinn asked if it would be same style as elevation slide.

Mr. Barbour answered yes it will be board on board.

Mr. Barbour spoke to the standards indicating he documented in packet.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview stating the property is part of the Benton Place subdivision which is a planned development. He referred to the aerial to how the property is adjacent to commercial property (Donkey Inn). She explained the fence request is only for the rear of his property that borders Donkey. Ms. Bremanis stated the fence will be a straight across board on board fence.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if commercial properties adjacent to residential are allowed to have 8ft fences.

Ms. Bremanis answered yes explaining per code if Donkey Inn asked for the fence they would be allowed it in the same location. She further explained code does not speak for residential so the variation is required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioner is requesting to install an 8-foot fence along the rear property line, which is adjacent to a commercially zoned property. Per code, commercial properties may install an 8-foot fence along property lines, adjacent to a residentially zoned property. However, the code does not currently apply to residentially zoned properties abutting commercial properties. The proposed 8-foot fence will be located only in the rear yard adjacent to the commercial property. The side yards adjacent to residential property would still only permit a maximum fence height of 6-feet. The proposed fence should not change the character of the locality and screening from a commercial property is understandable. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Variation subject to the following conditions:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the plans submitted by Petitioner on 8/31/2020 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. Cavanaugh made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh stated he thinks this is an oversight of the code. He stated he thinks an 8ft fence adjacent to commercial should be allowed for residential properties. He spoke to the standard indicating it is a unique circumstance and won't alter the essential character of the locality.

Ms. Roth-Wurster agreed with Mr. Cavanaugh that the standards have been met.

Ms. Wood stated a homeowner would expect to enjoy backyard without noise so thinks it meets reasonable return and won't alter essential character with 8ft on other side and vegetation.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will go to Village Council on November 2, 2020.

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. 1070 S. Brockway Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 28, 2020 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use & Variation
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Site Plan
5. Addition Elevations
6. Fence Site Plan
7. Fence Elevation
8. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. Chris Gibala owner 1070 S Brockway

Mr. Gibala explained they are looking for special uses for an addition that will encroach into the setbacks and the other for a fence. He explained the reason for the requests is they have 2 kids and are looking to expand family so need more space. Mr. Gibala stated they are requesting the fence for protection explaining they find half eaten animals and think it's from coyotes.

Ms. Wood asked about location of fence.

Mr. Gibala referred to existing conditions slide to show location of addition and fence

Ms. Bremanis referred to elevations slide.

Mr. Pirog asked if this was approved a few years ago.

Ms. Bremanis explained they were approved for the setback but are now adding a second floor addition.

Discussion on the previous approval.

Discussion on where the fence will be.

Mr. Gibala explained the fence will be 5ft in from the lot line which is the inside of the bushes.

Ms. Bremanis explained the bushes are in the right of way and if fence were constructed public works would want to have the bushes removed as they are not appropriate to be in the right of way.

Ms. Wood clarified there will be landscaping.

Ms. Bremanis referred to fence plan slide showing where the landscaping would be. She explained the red line on the site plan shows permitted location of a fence per their previous setback relief.

Mr. Pirog asked if any neighbors have similar fences.

Ms. Bremanis answered no not that she could find.

Mr. Gibala stated there are no other situations like theirs. He stated there is one down street that has an iron fence but they are looking for more privacy. He explained they are also looking to get a smaller dog, which would be able to get through that style fence.

Mr. Pirog clarified the fence will be full enclosed but the relief is just for the one side.

Ms. Bremanis referred to site plan slide to show location highlighted in green. She further explained the area below red line is the area that requires relief.

Ms. Wood asked if the slide shows the style fence.

Mr. Gibala answered explaining he adjusted his original plan from a 6ft cedar to 5ft vinyl to accommodate neighbors' concerns.

Mr. McGinn asked why they are seeking relief to bring fence to the 5ft.

Mr. Gibala explained they would lose a lot of his yard if installed where allowed.

Ms. Wood asked if he spoke to the neighbors.

Mr. Gibala explained he spoke to the neighbor that previously emailed their concern concerning a 6' solid cedar fence as well as the neighbor that is in attendance tonight. He stated he spoke to others who didn't have any concerns. Mr. Gibala stated the view is not issue pointing out the bushes are taller than the proposed fence.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview explaining the property is Zoned R1 and has relief due to the previous addition at 25ft from the lot line. She referred to the site plan to show the proposed encroachment. She stated the building meets height, building and lot coverage code. She stated Community Services and Engineering have review and did not identify any issues. Ms. Bremanis explained the special use requirements for fences.

Ms. Wood asked about the rationale behind the ordinance in respect of front yard fencing, fencing in a rear yard side yard abutting a street

Ms. Bremanis explained the fence at 90 E Benton was a variation because it was along their rear lot line not visible from the street. She explained this request is more open to the public and has more of an effect on the neighborhood so the standards are in place.

Ms. Wood asked which street the house to the back faces.

Ms. Bremanis referred to aerial explaining the home faces Bryant. She noted the property was annexed in 1990 as existing nonconforming. She further pointed out on the aerial a lot of the homes do not meet the required setbacks.

Discussion on verbiage of fence abutting.

Mr. Pirog asked if approved who is responsible for mowing and landscaping.

Ms. Bremanis answered the petitioner.

Mr. Pirog stated the request seems to make them lose a lot of yard.
Mr. Gibala pointed out without the relief he loses a lot more yard.

Sworn in Mr. Frank Skorski 145 W Bryant

Mr. Skorski spoke to the conditions of the annexations that allowed existing conditions until properties were sold and would be forced to meet code. He spoke to new built homes in the area that have met code. He explained he spoke to Mr. Gibala and gave his approval for the addition but explained he didn't want a fence put up. Mr. Skorski explained the neighborhood doesn't have many fences and the ones that are there are 3-4ft chain link. Mr. Skorski pointed out one neighbor has a 5ft fence to protect her dog from the coyotes. He stated he thinks the 5ft solid fence is too high being more a wall than a fence. Mr. Skorski stated the advantage of a chain link fence is you can see through it. He spoke to the standards pointing out the request does not meet them.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked Mr. Skorski if he is opposed to a fence or a vinyl fence.
Mr. Skorski explained he is opposed to a solid white vinyl fence, which will deteriorate.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if the cedar fence would be ok.
Mr. Skorski answered no because it is still solid. He stated his concern is when people see a wall they are unsure if it is a good neighborhood.

Ms. Wood asked about wrought iron.
Mr. Skorski stated that would be ok but that would not work with his dog.

Sworn in Mr. Jim Reichert 58 W Bryant

Mr. Reichert stated he has no concerns with the addition. He stated he chose the neighborhood because it is a natural neighborhood. He expressed concern with the solid fence along a road will change the community. Mr. Reichert stated he thinks it should be an open fence with tall enough landscaping to cover.

Mr. Skorski stated he didn't oppose the addition and thinks if a fence goes in it should be setback to the 25ft so it is not visible from the street as much.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked Mr. Skorski if he would oppose the location if the fence was an open style.
Mr. Skorski answered no.

Mr. Gibala pointed out there is no view currently because of the tall messy bushes. He stated he thought he was conceding with going down from 6ft to 5ft.

Ms. Wood spoke to the aesthetic criteria being a rear yard side yard abutting a street request.

Mr. Gibala stated he has never seen a wrought iron for privacy and that is what they are looking for. He pointed out they are also more expensive. He stated he was willing to pay more for the vinyl to concede with the neighbors' request.

Mr. Luszczyk asked Mr. Gibala if he would be willing to set the fence back to 25ft. Mr. Gibala stated he didn't need relief at 25ft and could go 6ft. He pointed out that would be ridiculous because he would have a large area of unusable yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. Bremanis explained the requests have been separated to include a recommendation for the addition and a separate for the fence.

The Petitioner is requesting to construct an addition, which encroaches into the required side yards. The Petitioner received relief for the side yard abutting a street setback, for an addition to the west and is requesting the same setback for a second story addition. On the interior side yard (north), the setback is legally non-conforming, from annexation, at approximately 14 feet. The Petitioner would like to expand the single 1-car garage to a 2-car garage. Any addition would require setback relief. The neighborhood was annexed into the Village in 1990, with an R-1 designation, and many of the properties in area are legally non-conforming for the interior side yard setbacks (ranging from 5 feet to 9 feet). The Petitioner is requesting an interior side yard setback (north) of 7 feet. Therefore, the proposed addition should not impact the surrounding property owners or alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use request for side yard setbacks with the following condition:

1. The Special Use for the side yard setbacks shall substantially conform to the addition site plan and elevation plans prepared by the architect, Archimax Inc dated 7/02/20, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

The Petitioner is also requesting to build a 5-foot tall fence, 5 feet from the side lot line abutting a street and the side lot line of the front yard of an adjacent lot. Per code, the proposed fence requires a 25-foot side yard abutting a street setback to be set back 25 feet (previously approved Special Use). Fences in corner side yards are not prevalent in this neighborhood. However, there are existing bushes, which provide screening. The bushes are in the right away and would be removed, with new landscaping required in the 5 feet between the proposed fence and lot line. This may alter the characteristic of fencing in side yards abutting a street, but should not have a negative impact on sight lines. Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the ZBA decides to recommend approval Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The Special Use for the fence shall substantially conform to the fence site plan and elevation plan submitted by the Petitioner on 9/3/20, except as such plans may be changed to conform to Village Codes and Ordinances.

Mr. Skorski clarified staff's recommendation.

Ms. Bremanis explained approval of setback and action at discretion on fence.

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

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Dittrich stated the property goes past the bushes on the interior side lot line and thinks adding the second garage may be the only thing up for debate. He pointed out they already have approval for the setback on the addition and are only going up not encroaching any further. He stated he does not see any issues.

Ms. Wood stated she does not see it having a negative impact or a reason to present a problem with the public health safety and welfare.

Ms. Roth-Wurster stated the architectural plans look nice. She pointed out there are larger homes in the neighborhood so this would fit in.

Motion passed unanimously 8-0

This item will tentatively go to Village Council on October 19, 2020.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked if motion to approve is only for vinyl or any material.
Ms. Bremanis explained the way it is written it is for vinyl.

Mr. Cavanaugh recommended approve the fence as a general fence with the petitioner to decide material.
Discussion on wording and neighbors' concerns.

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

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh stated if they put taller landscaping it would cover the fence which would give the homeowner what he wants and being applicable to the neighbors to make it look more appealing. He stated he is not in favor of white vinyl but in favor of a fence. He stated maybe staff could dictate landscaping.

Ms. Roth-Wurster spoke to other corner fences. She pointed out this area is more open vistas. She stated if going forward would prefer to add specific conditions. She stated she thinks it will change the character of the neighborhood and doesn't think the petitioner gave a valid reason to need a privacy fence. She pointed out corner lots typically have issues.

Mr. Dittrich stated he is familiar with the neighborhood and respects the openness. He stated the property owner feels he needs protection from coyotes and for his family he doesn't think the board should deny it. He stated he

sympathizes with the owner as he is making changes to his original plans at his own expense to compromise with neighbors and even the compromises are insufficient.

Discussion on the responsibility of the board to vote on such requests.

Mr. Dittrich pointed out the owner tried to appease the neighbors and now the changes are not good enough. He stressed the board is here to address the request with the petitioner and hear the neighbors' concerns. He stated the request should be to address the fence not the type or material.

Ms. Wood stated everyone has different opinion on fences. She stated the owner has the right to put any fence 25ft back but once he wants to come out further he needs board approval. She stated the request needs to be looked at not from personal opinion but rather to address the standards. Ms. Wood spoke to the standards and stated given the type of fence she does not feel it has met them.

Mr. Dittrich pointed out the vistas will be changing with either a fence going up and the bushes coming down or the bushes because of the unruliness of them. Discussion on the vistas.

Mr. Pirog stated he does not think it meets the standards. He stated it is protecting his lot at the expense of others.

Motion passed 5-3

Ayes: Larson, Luszczak, McGinn, Cavanaugh, Dittrich

Nay: Roth-Wurster, Wood, Pirog

This item will tentatively go to Village Council on October 19, 2020.

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

3. 249 N. Plum Grove Road

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 28, 2020 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 Plan
5. Elevations
6. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. John Gardello 249 N Plum Grove

Mr. Gardello explained he wants to replace the garage making it bigger and moving as forward as he can. He stated it is the old Sears house and are trying to keep the aesthetics the same. Mr. Gardello explained in order to do so he needs small variances on the distances between the garage and both the lot line and the addition. He referred to the existing conditions to show location of current garage explaining he wants to put the new garage in same location but a little further up so needs a small variance.

Ms. Wood asked if the addition will go to the rear of the existing garage.

Mr. Gardello explained plan referring to slides. He stressed he is trying to stay within the aesthetics of the home being the old Sears house designed by Frank Lloyd Wright.

Mr. Larson clarified the request is for a few inches.

Mr. Gardello answered yes. He explained if he moves it back it will ruin his flower garden. He pointed out the request only impacts on one neighbor and she is okay with it.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified the surrounding properties also have bigger detached garages.

Mr. Gardello answered yes. He stated that some are closer to their lot lines than his. He explained he is not asking for a lot just trying to make it look as best as can.

Mr. McGinn asked if neighbor Linda he spoke to is located at 243 Plum Grove Road and if she is ok with the request.

Mr. Gardello answered yes she said make beautiful. He explained the garage is already there and leaning so needs to be replaced. Mr. Gardello will match all exterior characteristic so will look nice.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview explaining the property is zoned R2. She stated the existing garage is 4ft1inch from side lot line and looking to decrease to 3ft 8inches. She explained the addition to the back of the home is creating the

5inch setback relief. Ms. Bremanis stated the proposed garage meets height and lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Larson asked if any departments had issues.

Ms. Bremanis answered no Community Services and Engineering reviewed and had no issues.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Petitioners are proposing to replace an existing non-conforming detached garage, with a new and slightly larger detached garage. The side yard setback for the new garage would be approximately 5 inches closer to the side lot line (3 feet 8 inches vs. the existing condition of 4 feet 1 inches). In addition, the Petitioners are proposing to build an addition off the rear of the primary structure that will put the distance between the principal structure and detached garage at 9 feet 6 inches, also requiring setback relief. The proposed garage meets the height requirement and with the addition to the residence, any detached garage would require relief (setback from principal structure), unless relocated farther into the rear yard. The property is narrow at 66 feet versus the current minimum 75-foot lot width and there are several non-conforming (side-yard setbacks) detached garages in the area. Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the ZBA recommends approval of the Variation, Staff recommends the following condition:

1. The Variation shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Jakl Brandeis Architects Ltd. dated 5/06/2020 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. Cavanaugh made a motion to approve subject staff's conditions; seconded by Ms. Roth-Wurster.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Cavanaugh stated the circumstances are unique for entire neighborhood being smaller lots. He pointed out there are four existing nonconforming garages in neighborhood as well as adjacent neighbors having larger conforming garages so the character of locality won't be affected. He stated the standards for unique circumstances are met because it is a smaller lot.

Ms. Roth-Wurster agreed standards have been met. She stated they are being very purposeful with the design and should look very nice when it is done.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will go to Village Council on November 2, 2020.

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

4. 113 S. Walnut Street

Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 28, 2020 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

Petitioner's Exhibits:

1. Application for Special Use & Variation
2. Proof of Ownership
3. Plat of Survey
4. Site Plan
5. Elevations
6. Letters Of Support
7. Public Notice

Sworn in petitioner: Mr. Pat Noonan 113 S Walnut

Mr. Noonan stated they originally were going to build an addition but his wife changed her mind so now going with a larger garage. He stated they recently inherited some items from family so are looking for larger garage for storage. He spoke to other neighbors that have similar garages in size and height so will not be odd for neighborhood.

Mr. Pirog asked where the information for the other 2 garages in neighborhood came from.

Ms. Bremanis answered both have ordinance associated associate with their relief than included the dimensions.

Ms. Bremanis gave a brief overview stating the property is zoned R2. She explained code allows accessory structures up to 700sqft but cannot exceed 50% of the floor area of the primary structure. She pointed out the house itself is a smaller single story structure which puts them at a maximum 545sqft per code. She stated the current accessory square footage is at the maximum of 545sqft with the existing garage and a shed they have already removed. Ms. Bremanis explained they plan to remove both to build the new garage. She stated the Petitioner indicated the upper level is for storage only. She spoke to the height being peak height of 21ft which due to not doing the addition the garage exceeds the height of the primary structure. Ms. Bremanis referred to the slides to show similar garages in neighborhood. She stated with the addition request being removed setback and building coverage all meet code. She spoke to the height and square footage of the other similar garages in neighborhood.

Discussion on the other garage height being peak at 26ft.

Discussion on the current request peak height 21ft.

Mr. Cavanaugh asked what the peak height of the principal structure.

Ms. Bremanis explained the architect approximates it at 18ft.

Discussion on how allowed square footage of accessory structures is calculated.

Ms. Bremanis pointed out the request is for a garage at 780sqft garage which even if the home was larger would still need relief for 80sqft.

Ms. Bremanis explained the garage is going to be pushed further back than existing garage.

Ms. Wood asked if it will be partially hidden by home.
Ms. Bremanis answered yes.

Mr. Cavanaugh pointed out the yard slopes down so even though it is taller it will be set down.

Mr. Larson asked if Mr. Noonan spoke to the neighbor next door.
Mr. Noonan stated all adjacent neighbors sent letters.

Mr. Pirog asked if the lot sizes are smaller than normal.
Discussion on size.
Ms. Bremanis stated it is narrow but deep.

Mr. Cavanaugh clarified the aerial stars on the aerial are the other garages.
Ms. Bremanis answered yes.

Mr. Pirog asked if the height is only the special use.
Ms. Bremanis answered yes. She explained the variation is for the square footage and the special use is for height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Detached garages are both typical and common in this subdivision. Several of which received similar zoning relief for height and overall square footage. The Petitioners are requesting to build a detached garage that exceeds both the maximum square footage and height zoning requirements for an accessory structure. The Petitioner has indicated there are two existing detach garages similar to proposed detached garage including one that is taller than the primary structure. While the garage is larger than the permitted square feet, the lot coverage still meets code and all of the setback requirements. The height is taller than the primary structure, however there is an elevation change on the property that would reduce the impact and several mature trees that are significantly higher than the proposed garage. In addition, the submitted plans indicate that the second story would be unfinished and for storage only.

Therefore, Staff recommends action at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If the ZBA recommends approval of the Special use and Variation, Staff recommends the following condition:

1. The Special Use and Variation shall substantially conform to the plans prepared by Carlson Architecture dated 8/21/2020 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 Mr. Larson.

DELIBERATIONS:

Mr. Dittrich stated there are a lot of detached garages that have similar square footage so that request is straight forward and easy to approve. He stated the height issue is notable but not a deal breaker. He stated the height of the garage does not destroy vistas or alter essential characteristics of locality.

Mr. Larson stated usually with bigger garages the neighbors would have issues but the surrounding neighbors' submitted documentation they are okay with the proposal. He stated it will have no impact on the neighborhood.

Ms. Wood stated she lives in neighborhood. She stated she thinks it will improve the value and not have a negative impact. Ms. Wood stated she thinks it will increase the public health safety and welfare with it being setback further. She agreed with Mr. Dittrich the height would not make a huge difference and spoke to the neighbors signed off. Ms. Wood stated it would not alter essential character and spoke to the uniqueness with the home being one story and garage being partially shielded.

Mr. Pirog stated he is not keen but meets standards as long as no one lives in it. He pointed out there are 2 other homes with similar garages.

Ms. Wood summarized that this request has met the standards and was unanimously approved by a vote of 8-0. This item will tentatively go to Village Council on October 19, 2020.

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

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT