

**Village of Bartlett
Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes**

August 4, 2016

Chairman Werden called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: M. Werden, G. Koziol, B. Bucaro, P. Hanson, L. Hanson, J. Banno

Absent:

Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director, R. Grill, Assistant CD Director, A. Zubko, Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the July 7, 2016 meeting.

Motioned by: P. Hanson

Seconded by: G. Koziol

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Werden, G. Koziol, B. Bucaro, L. Hanson, P. Hanson

Nays: None

Abstain: J. Banno

The motion carried.

Case # 16-08 1512 Meridian Court, Variation – Rear Yard

PUBLIC HEARING

The Petitioners cousin **Giacomo Mauro** was in attendance and sworn in by **M. Werden**.

A. Zubko:

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**

M. Werden go ahead and present your case.

Giacomo Mauro the owners' cousin, resides at 129 Ambleside Road, Des Plaines, IL and is representing the homeowners with the same name, who are out of town. The homeowners are requesting a 10' variance to build their addition, which will realign the kitchen and add on to the family room. While working with the architect the homeowners were under the assumption that only needed a 30 foot rear yard so they are asking for an exemption of 10 feet. When applying for permits they realized they were 10 feet over from what is in the ordinance.

M. Werden questioned if there had been any calls or inquiries regarding this addition.

A.Zubko answered that there had only been one asking what a rear yard setback was but there were no issues.

P. Hanson commented when looking at the properties on Newcastle Lane they appear to have smaller setback.

A.Zubko replied that the setback should be the same. An accessory structure (not permanent) does not have to meet that setback.

B. Bucaro had the same impression looking at Trenton Lane.

G. Mauro: Stated that the lots are oddly shaped.

R. Grill said that properties that are zoned SR3 typically have a rear yard setback of 35 feet. This is a Planned Unit Development, and there was some flexibility from other restrictions that apply to this subdivision. This is a 700 lot subdivision with different phases. Each phase may have different setbacks.

M. Werden asked if there were any other questions. Since no questions were asked of the staff, the Public hearing portion was opened.

No one stepped forward.

M. Werden Further discussion or motion?

P. Hanson made a motioned to send a positive recommendation to the Village Board on Case # 16-08 Mauro, 1512 Meridian Court to allow the 10 foot variation in the rear yard.

Motioned: P. Hanson

Second: G. Koziol

Public Hearing was closed by **M. Werden**.

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, P. Hanson, M. Werden, L. Hanson, G. Koziol

Nays: J. Banno

M. Werden started a positive recommendation will be sent to the Village Board.

Case # 16-07 929 Rosewood Ct. Variation – Accessory Structure Less than 10 feet from Principal Structure

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**
- Exhibit D - Picture of Home before Structure**

Robert Kirk - Architect, 1100 Landmier, Elk Grove Village

The Petitioner: Roksolana Polerecky, resides at 929 Rosewood Court. Both were sworn in by M. Werden.

R. Kirk stated he had done an addition on this residence a number of years ago. The homeowners recently built a screened in porch on the existing patio. It is adjacent to the existing house with access into the screened porch. The homeowner has a serious back ailment that makes it difficult for her to go up steps. To allow her access to the porch, it was built closer to the home than the code allows therefore the homeowner's are asking for a 10 foot variance. The base of the patio is 5 inches, not a full foundation, also why this is not attached and just bolted in.

Staff questioned as to how long this is has been there and why it is not sided or is it just unfinished?

R. Polerecky stated that the roof and pillars were built sometime ago but recently added the doors and screens.

A. Zubko answered that it was discovered that they were building it without a permit and were asked to stop. Since it is considered an accessory structure and not connected to the house it can just be put on a concrete pad. The building will be sided to match the existing home.

G. Koziol stated that there was a conflict of definition on the architect's letter. First it is called an accessory structure and then a sun room. Which is it?

R. Kirk replied that was his error it is considered a covered screened porch and has no mechanicals or running water. There is a deck adjacent to the pool but not attached to this structure. The ceiling is white siding.

G. Koziol expressed concern that this may be a possible problem to a future homeowner if this accessory structure is approved.

P. Hanson commented it was an accessory structure such as an above ground pool, some will like it some will not. It can easily be taken down since it not attached to the home.

M. Werden asked the reason there was never a permit for this structure.

R. Polerecky stated that since it was not an addition to the home she wasn't aware that she needed a permit.

Discussion amongst staff took place trying to clarify exactly what this accessory structure looks like being it only has three sides. Why would one side be open near the house and the other three sides have siding and windows? It was explained that is was somewhat of a Gazebo with one open side. There were no other questions by Staff.

M. Werden opened up the Public Hearing.

Brook Lavin-Robb of 932 Rosewood Court was there to comment in favor of the screen porch. Also, everyone she talked to only had nice things to say.

P. Hanson made motion to send a positive recommendation to the Village Board for Case # 16-07, 929 Rosewood Ct.

Motion: P. Hanson

Second: B. Bucaro

M. Werden closed the Public Hearing.

M. Werden noted that this was a very unusual request. His original concern was if the foundation would be substantial enough and it appears it will be.

R. Kirk provided a drawing to the building department to get a permit. He recommended that on each of the four corners, have structural sonotube added to help support the structure and give it more stability. Microlams will be added to the structure over the sliding glass doors for the same reason.

This is something that must meet the Village building codes. The strengthening of the structure still needs to be done if the variance is approved. Once the homeowner's meet the Zoning codes they may proceed with the building permit.

No further discussion.

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, P. Hanson, M. Werden, L. Hanson, G. Koziol

Nays: J. Banno

M. Werden started a positive recommendation will be sent to the Village Board.

Old Business: The Village may have broken a record for "Train Whistle Blowing" at National Night Out. Old record was 1127 participants and Bartlett had 1581.

New Business: Public Hearing on Thursday September 1, 2016 for Ashton Gardens. Everyone was encouraged to attend.

Motioned to approve: P. Hanson

Seconded: L. Hanson

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32