

MINUTES OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
December 14, 2015

The regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order by Board Member William Cotey at 7:00 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members present: Board Member William Cotey, Amy Flores, Matthew Krummick, Mark Moore, Walter Oakley, Kurt Schultz, and David Semmelman.

Members absent: None.

Village Staff present: John Spoden, Director of Community Development; David Smith, Senior Planner, and Fred Chung, Senior Project Engineer.

Board Member Oakley moved, seconded by Board Member Schultz, to approve the October 12, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes.

Motion carried 7 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS:

**ZBA 15-28 Libertyville Little League, Applicant
 815 Lake Street, Butler Lake Park**

Request is for a variation to increase the maximum height of recreational light poles from 25 feet to approximately 60 feet in order to install four (4) recreational light poles in an OS, Open Space District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the requested variation and Site Plan Permit. He stated that the petitioner is requesting approval of a Site Plan Permit and variation in order to install lighting for recreational purposes in an OS, Open Space District located at Flood Baseball Field at Butler Lake Park located at 815 West Lake Street. He stated that the light poles proposed are at a height of approximately 60 feet and will require a variation from the Zoning Code to allow an increase in the maximum permitted height from 25 feet to 60 feet. Mr. Smith stated that the Libertyville Little League was approved for a similar variation for Flood Field, also located in Butler Lake Park in 2006.

Mr. Bill Bennett, representative of the Libertyville Little League, stated that night games are necessary in order to manage the capacity of Little League baseball activity at Butler Lake Park. He stated that the lighting product is from MUSCO Lighting and that the fixtures are provided with shields in order to protect the neighboring residential properties from glare nuisance.

Commissioner Oakley asked if the subject site is within the flood plain. Mr. Fred Chung, Senior Project Engineer, stated that the area is within the flood plain and flood way. He stated that the petitioner will be required to obtain a Water Shed Permit.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 2 of 13

Chairman Moore asked how tall the existing light standards are located in Flood Field. Mr. Bennett stated that the other lights are 60 feet in height.

Mr. David Miller, MUSCO Lighting, stated that the practice football field lights are 70 feet tall.

Mr. Bennett stated that he agrees to address the Staff review comments in the DRC Staff report.

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner what he would like for the Plan Commission to do this evening. Mr. Bennett stated that he would like for the Plan Commission to give their recommendation to the Village Board regarding their request.

In the matter of ZBA 15-28, Board Member Schultz moved, seconded by Board Member Moore, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a variation to increase the maximum height of recreational light poles from 25 feet to approximately 60 feet in order to install four (4) recreational light poles in an OS, Open Space District, subject to the following condition: 1) All recreational lighting shall be turned off not later than 10:00 p.m.

Motion carried 7 - 0.

Ayes: Cotey, Flores, Krummick, Moore, Oakley, Schultz, Semmelman

Nays: None

Absent: None

NEW BUSINESS:

ZBA 15-31 Libertyville School District 70, Applicant
801 S. 7th Avenue

Request is for variations to: 1) reduce the minimum required Perimeter Landscaped Open Space along the interior side property line from 50 feet to approximately 21.1 feet; and 2) reduce the minimum required Perimeter Landscaped Open Space along the front property line from 50 feet to approximately 25 feet in order to expand parking lot areas for property located in an IB, Institutional Buildings District for property located in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, introduced the petitioner's requests. He stated that School District 70 is requesting approval for variations to reduce the minimum required Perimeter Landscaped Open Space along the front and interior side property lines in order to expand parking lot areas for property located in an IB, Institutional Buildings District at 801 South 7th Avenue. Mr. Spoden stated that the petitioner is proposing to improve Copeland Manor Elementary School's facility by eliminating a mobile classroom, adding permanent classroom space and a new gymnasium, as well as associated site improvements including accessible routes and additional off-street parking. He stated that the proposed parking lot expansions require the Variations to reduce the minimum required Perimeter Landscaped Open Space.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 3 of 13

Mr. Spoden stated that the Zoning Code requires that for all uses in the IB, Institutional Buildings District, there shall be provided a Perimeter Landscaped Open Space with a minimum width of no less than fifty (50) feet along every lot line when abutting any Residential District.

Mr. Peter Graves, architect and representative of the petitioner, presented the proposed changes for the Copeland Manor Elementary School. He stated that the proposed improvements are intended to replace the mobile classrooms. He stated that the existing gymnasium is original with the rest of the school building that was constructed in 1956 and that the new gymnasium will be more conducive to current curriculum. He stated that additional parking is proposed in order to meet the Zoning Code requirement relative to the other improvements. He stated that the north parking lot will be extended to the west and an alternate new parking area is proposed at the southeast corner of the site as well.

Mr. Graves stated that the current existing building is approximately 47,000 square feet. He stated that the proposed additions comprise approximately 13,000 square feet bringing the total to approximately 60,000 square feet in floor area. He stated that the existing number of parking spaces is 52 spaces and they are proposing to increase that number to a total of 90 spaces which includes the alternate parking area at the southeast corner of the site.

Mr. Graves stated that the north parking lot extension incorporates landscaped island. He stated that the refuse area has been relocated outside of the fifty (50) foot setback. He stated that a portion of the hard play area will be removed in order to accommodate the parking lot extension.

Mr. Anthony McCormally, 719 East Glendale, stated that he is concerned about safety, aesthetics, and impact upon the flood plain. He stated that the back of his property abuts the school property and will be adjacent to the proposed parking lot extension. He stated that his daughter and many other school children who walk to school will be walking through the parking lot which appears that it will become a drop-off area. He stated that many children walk from Fourth Avenue along the paved bike path on the school's property up to and across where the proposed parking lot extension is located. He stated that there is a safety concern. He stated that children may be forced to walk along Glendale which does not have a sidewalk and then turn right onto Seventh Avenue. He stated that he is concerned about the impact that the proposed parking lot extension will have on the aesthetics, the open green space and if there will be parking lot lights glaring onto his property. He stated that he is concerned about the storm water runoff.

Mr. Graves stated that the refuse area will be screened in accordance to the Village code, and that the engineering for the parking lot improvements will comply with the storm water management regulations and that any light spillage will be contained to not exceed the Village requirements. He stated that that the foot candle illumination will be zero (0) at the property line. He stated that the asphalt path coming from Fourth Avenue will be re-routed around the parking lot extension.

Mr. McCormally stated that there will be an increased risk for the children walking to school who would cut through the parking lot. He stated that the school might consider installing perimeter fencing in order to help alleviate the safety risk.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 4 of 13

Mr. Graves stated that the proposed perimeter landscaping was negotiated with Village Staff.

Mr. Scott Nelson, 746 Seventh Avenue, stated he lives directly across the street from where they are proposing the alternate parking lot at the southeast corner of the school property. He stated that he supports the elimination of this particular parking area from the plans. He stated that he does not want to look a vehicle head lights from his property.

Mr. Jim Young, 713 East Glendale, stated that they bought their home in 2013. He stated that they like the land because it is close to the school with a great back yard adjacent to the open green space. He stated that he investigated the zoning before purchasing the property and learned that there is a 50 foot setback required for the school property. He stated that he understands that the school wants to reduce the parking on the street during special events. He stated that special events have been held at Copeland Manor for a long time.

Mr. Young stated he believes that the school does not have a compelling reason for the variation request and hopes that the school consider other options without extending the parking lot behind his house.

Mr. Florin Mitran, 754 Seventh Avenue, stated that he lives directly across the street from Copeland Manor and has three children who attend school there. He said that one of their reasons for buying their home was because of the green space across the street. He stated that most people park along Seventh Avenue for report card pick-up or other similar type events. He stated that the current traffic and parking management seems to work okay without the need for the proposed additional alternative parking lot. He is concerned about the negative impact that the parking area would have on the green space.

Mr. John Suhayda, 766 Seventh Avenue, stated that this proposal will contribute to the slow erosion of the residential nature of this block. He stated that the school has been a good neighbor and he applauds the school's effort to be active participant in the community but is concerned about the negative impact that the proposed parking lots will have on the community and the residential property values.

Mr. Kevin Garren, 736 Seventh Avenue, stated that he does not support the loss of valuable green space. He stated that he is not in favor of expanding parking areas surrounding the school. He stated that he does not mind the street parking.

Mr. John Glen, 629 Hampton, stated that he has lived in the Copeland Manor area since 1989 and his kids went to school there. He stated that he agrees that the school has been a very good neighbor. He stated that he would rather have cars parked on the streets for certain events in lieu of allowing more parking area on the school site itself. He stated that he is concerned that if the north parking lot is extended per the plan that the Glendale residents will install additional privacy fencing along the new parking lot extension along the west.

Ms. Jennifer Maslic, 740 Seventh Avenue, stated that she just moved into her residence about two months ago. She stated that she is concerned about the reduction of green space. She asked

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 5 of 13

about the number of parking spaces proposed for the new parking area adjacent to Seventh Avenue.

Mr. Graves stated that sixteen (16) spaces are proposed for the parking lot located in the southeast corner of the school property.

Ms. Maslic stated that she is concerned about the loss of green space and does not understand the need for the alternate 16 space parking lot.

Mr. Amerigo Carnazzola, 722 Valley Park Drive, stated that the proposed alternate parking lot is a bad idea as it would take away the only good flat green space on the school property. He stated that he would rather the school let people park on the street than to expand the asphalt for on-site parking. He stated that he does not believe that the school has a compelling reason for the parking lot expansion.

Mr. Graves stated that enrollment at Copeland Manor is trending flat. He stated that they are adding classrooms to replace the temporary modular classroom structures.

Mr. Carnazzola stated that he supports the building addition but does not support the reduction of green space for the expanded parking lots.

Ms. Lisa Mitron, 754 Seventh Avenue, asked if the building expansion is triggering the requirement for increased number of parking spaces. Mr. Graves stated that the increase in parking is based on the Zoning Code regulation.

Ms. Mitron stated that she is concerned about the potential impact on storm water management.

Mr. Graves stated that the civil engineering plans are required to address the storm water management and that there will be collection of water as part of those plans.

Mr. Don Dixon, Civil Engineer representing the applicant, stated that the parking lot is required to be curbed and storm water will be managed.

Mr. Mike Lucas, 728 Valley Park Drive, stated that if the school enrollment is flat then there doesn't appear to be a need for more parking. He stated that he does not support the loss of green space on the school property. He stated that he does not have a problem with the use of the street for parking during certain events at the school.

Mr. Lucas asked about the parking lot lighting for the alternative parking lot near Seventh Avenue. Mr. Graves stated that no new lighting is proposed for that lot.

Ms. Jane Emmerich, 753 Seventh Avenue, stated that her home is across the street from the proposed alternate parking lot and has lived there since August. She stated that this plan is a waste of money in order to sacrifice the green space. She stated that she is also concerned about the storm water drainage.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 6 of 13

Mr. Graves describe the proposed parking lot plan. He stated that with the alternate parking lot included the total number of parking spaces would be 90. He stated that currently there are 52 spaces on site and with the building improvements a minimum of 67 spaces are required. He stated that a minimum of 15 more parking spaces are required.

Board Member Schultz stated he knows the site well and that he has two children that attended Copeland Manor. He stated that he knows that the gymnasium addition is necessary. He stated that there didn't seem to be any objections to the gym addition and the replacement of the mobile classrooms. He stated that he does not support the alternate parking lot at the southeast corner of the school site. He asked the applicant if they would be interested in reducing the proposed number of parking spaces. Mr. Graves stated that it is the Zoning Code that is forcing the School District to propose an increase in the number of parking spaces. He stated that it would be the School District's preference to not have to build the alternative parking lot.

Board Member Schultz asked the applicant what the preferred number of parking spaces would be. Mr. Graves stated that the School District does not foresee an increase in enrollment in the near future, but at the same time they do not want to sell themselves short relative to the parking lot improvements and they want to take advantage of the economies of scale that would come into play. He stated that at a minimum they want to construct the parking lot improvements along the north property line. He stated that they might be willing to reduce the additional parking spaces by half.

Board Member Schultz stated that due to the building additions and how they layout on the site plan, the proposal makes sense but inquired as to whether or not they can reduce the proposed number of parking spaces or not. Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that the Zoning Code would require only 67 total parking spaces so they can afford to reduce the number of spaces proposed.

Board Member Schultz stated that the 22 additional spaces along the north property line could be cut down by seven (7) parking stalls. He asked the petitioner if they would be willing to do that. Mr. Graves stated that they would be willing to cut down the number of spaces.

Board Member Schultz stated that street parking can help to accommodate the larger events conducted at the school.

Mr. Graves stated that the extension of the parking lot along the north also provides easier access to the proposed refuse enclosure relocation.

Board Member Schultz asked for clarification regarding the changes proposed for the outdoor hard court play area. Mr. Graves stated that approximately half of the outdoor court play area will be removed as part of the parking lot extension.

Board Member Schultz stated that the bike racks should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Graves stated that they will be replaced.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 7 of 13

Board Member Schultz asked Village Staff if the Village would allow some of the proposed parking spaces to be landbanked. Mr. Spoden stated that the Zoning Code permits parking space landbanking.

Board Member Schultz asked if District 70, applicant, would be willing to landbank some of the parking spaces. Mr. Graves stated that they would entertain the landbanking suggestion.

Board Member Schultz asked why the alternate parking lot at the southeast corner of the school site is on the plan. Mr. Graves stated that it became a secondary location to get the cars off of the street and that it was closer to the cafeteria.

Board Member Schultz stated that he is not supportive of the alternate parking lot at the southeast corner of the school site. He stated that for the parking lot extension along the north should be cut down to the bare minimum. He stated that a privacy fence along the north property line should be considered as well.

Board Member Krummick stated the parking study provided by Gewalt Hamilton indicated that the peak capacity of the parking lot does not exceed 43 spaces occupied by vehicles. He stated that as the building exists today that there is sufficient parking. He stated that it seemed odd that the residents who have spoken have supported keeping cars parked on the street and not in the parking lot. He asked why the petitioner is planning for 90 parking spaces when the Zoning Code requires a minimum of 67 parking spaces. Mr. Graves stated that they have studied the school and its use for the property. He stated that the southeast parking lot is planned as an alternate, not an immediate proposal to be constructed. He stated that the intent was to address those who needed closer access to the cafeteria.

Board Member Krummick stated that his initial thought about the alternate southeast parking lot was not that objectionable and had more concerns about the north parking lot extension. He stated that after further discussion transpired, he realized that the alternate lot is not necessary. He stated that consideration should be given to eliminated the nine (9) spaces on the north side of the north parking lot extension. He stated that excessive paving should not be constructed if not needed.

Board Member Semmelman stated that the southeast parking lot should be eliminated and the only install the number of spaces to meet the Zoning Code.

Board Member Moore stated he is concerned about the request for the variance based upon a plan that far exceeds the minimum required number of parking spaces. He asked if the site plan design would be different if it incorporated the minimum required number of parking spaces. Mr. Graves stated that the primary focus was on the north lot. He stated that it made sense to continue the northern edge line of the existing parking lot when planning the extension for appropriate traffic flow. He stated in order to just plan for the minimum number of spaces required by code would not have been accomplished without the need for the setback variation anyway. He stated that the additional parking spaces were part of a longer term planning process and to get parked cars off of the street.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 8 of 13

Board Member Moore stated that he would be more inclined to support a plan that came closer to meeting the Zoning Code requirements.

Mr. Graves stated that one of the earlier plan versions contemplated no landscaped islands in the parking lot but then soon learned that this is not an authorized variation. He stated that by incorporating the parking lot landscaped island forces the parking lot lane further out. He stated that shifting the gymnasium further south would cause the loss of some classroom space.

Board Member Flores asked if the petitioner considered utilizing the outdoor hard court play area for overflow parking when needed. Mr. Graves stated that the current condition of the existing play area is such that it would have to be reconstructed in order to accommodate overflow parking.

Board Member Flores stated that it seems like it would serve an appropriate long term problem and be a win-win outcome.

Board Member Oakley stated that he understands the need for the gym and classroom addition but cannot see the need for the increase in the parking lot areas.

Mr. Jim Young, 713 Glendale, stated that the parking proposal does not make sense. He stated that the petitioner's reason for the parking lot expansion is to handle special events but the residents who spoke tonight indicated that they support overflow parking to take place on the street. He stated that his home is directly behind the outdoor basketball court and if the school wanted to overflow park on that court he wouldn't mind.

Mr. Amerigo Carnazzola, 722 Valley Park Drive, stated that due to the traffic study indicating that the parking lot peaks between 41 and 43 parked cars in the school's parking lot then it doesn't make sense to add more parking spaces. He stated that he supports the building additions, but to leave the green space as is.

Chairman Cotey stated he would like for the petitioner to address the comments that were provided tonight. He stated that he is recommending that these variation requests be continued to a future Zoning Board of Appeals meeting in order to provide the petitioner the opportunity to revise their plans. He stated that the petitioner could consider including a fence to help buffer the parking lot improvements from the residential neighbors to the north. He stated that he other option that could be considered is to opt for a parking variation in lieu of the setback variation. He stated that the petitioner might also consider discussing the landbanked parking option with Village Staff. He stated that the revised plans should show more detail as to where the handicap parking and bike racks are to be located on the site and how traffic will flow in the parking lots as well.

In the matter of ZBA 15-31, Board Member Schultz moved, seconded by Board Member Semmelman, to continue this item to the January 25, 2016, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Motion carried 7 - 0.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 9 of 13

Ayes: Cotey, Flores, Krummick, Moore, Oakley, Schultz, Semmelman
Nays: None
Absent: None

ZBA 15-32 Shelley Kuehneman, Applicant
544 Dawes Street

Request is for a variation to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 30 feet to approximately 25.5 feet in order to construct a front porch and steps in an R-6, Single Family Residential District.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, introduced the requested variation. He stated that the petitioner is requesting a variation to reduce the minimum required front yard setback in order to construct a front porch and steps in an R-6, Single Family Residential District at 544 Dawes Street. The subject lot is approximately 7,638 square feet in area.

Mr. John Robbins, architect for the petitioner, stated that the petitioner is proposing to replace their existing front porch, steps, and walkway. He stated that the residence is a 1955 ranch house with a dilapidated front porch and steps in major need of replacement. He stated that the new porch will encroach four and one-half (4.5') feet into the front yard for a width of nine (9') feet. He stated that the scope of work includes replacing the front walk with a smaller brick paver path thereby reducing the existing lot coverage.

Board Member Schultz stated that it appears to be a reasonable request.

Board Member Krummick stated that the new front porch and steps do not appear to encroach any further than what the existing porch does.

Board Member Cotey asked the petitioner if they agree to comply with the Staff review comments. Mr. Robbins stated that they will address all the comments.

In the matter of ZBA 15-32, Board Member Schultz moved, seconded by Board Member Krummick, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a variation to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 30 feet to approximately 25.5 feet in order to construct a front porch and steps in an R-6, Single Family Residential District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 7 - 0.

Ayes: Cotey, Flores, Krummick, Moore, Oakley, Schultz, Semmelman
Nays: None
Absent: None

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 10 of 13

ZBA 15-33 Eugene Maher, Applicant
318 Elm Court

Request is for a variation a variation to reduce the minimum required lot width from 60 feet to approximately 57.3 feet in order to resubdivide Lots 10 and 11 located in the J. Eli Triggs Subdivision in an R-6, Single Family Residential District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the requests by the petitioner. He stated that the petitioner is requesting approval for a Plat of Resubdivision for Lots 10 and 11 located in the J. Eli Triggs Subdivision at 318 Elm Court and a variation to reduce the minimum required lot width as part of the same resubdivision request. He stated that the subject two lots are located in an R-6, Single Family Residential District.

Mr. Smith stated that the variation request is to allow for a reduction of the minimum required lot width from 60 feet to 57.33 as a consequence to the resubdivision for the subject property. He stated that the newly created vacant lot would have the 57.3 feet width as measured at the building setback line and the single family residence at 318 Elm Court, on the other lot, will remain preserved as is, with a lot width of 75.7 feet.

Mr. Adam Lyons, architect representing the petitioner, stated the requested actions are intended to preserve the existing historical residence while creating a buildable lot next to it. He stated that the variation of lot width is not inconsistent with many other lots in the area as they are only 50 feet in width. He stated that they will relocate the existing fire pit behind the residence so that it remains conforming in its setback after the re-platting of the property line is complete. He stated that any new development on the proposed vacant lot shall comply with Storm Water Management Commission requirements.

Mr. David Amidei, 326 Elm Court, stated that the land area is not flat. He stated that their house has had water problems. He stated that storm water drainage comes from the homes located to the rear of his home. He stated that he is concerned about water runoff and what the architectural character will be with any new development on the newly created vacant lot.

Mr. Fred Chung, Senior Project Engineer, stated that the storm water utility infrastructure is designed to be based on 10 year rain events. He stated that all storm water management systems have a finite capacity. He stated that the new storm water management ordinance that incorporates a detention requirement is intended to reduce the impact of flooding.

Board Member Oakley asked what options are available for storm water detention for single family properties. Mr. Chung stated that any new residential development needs to be engineered in order to reduce the run-off onto the neighbor's property.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that review by the Appearance Review Commission is not required by the Village. He stated that the Historic Preservation Commission is still in its infancy and not ready to review applications for preservation of structures in the Village as of yet.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 11 of 13

Mr. Amidei stated that the storm water runs off of the properties on Laurel Avenue towards them. He stated that he is concerned about how water run-off is calculated.

Mr. Chung stated that storm water run-off and detention calculations need to be engineered.

Ms. Virginia Renfroe, 312 Elm Court, stated that she is concerned that the development of the newly created vacant lot will be detrimental to the neighborhood and will reduce the natural sun light.

Mr. Scott Renfroe, 312 Elm Court, stated he is concerned that any new development on the proposed vacant lot will end up being too large. He stated that Elm Court is already a very busy street and that the new development will increase the congestion.

Mr. Steve Novak, 329 Elm Court, stated that he is concerned about the scale and impact that any new development will bring on the proposed new lot. He is concerned about the increase in density. He stated that the School Street development is a good development, but that the Heritage Area is not an appropriate area for higher density.

Board Member Oakley asked if this property is in the flood plain. Mr. Chung stated that it is not in the flood plain.

Board Member Flores stated that it is difficult to support this request without knowing more about the cause of the area's flooding issues.

Board Member Moore asked what the new lot coverage will be on the lot with the existing house. Chairman Cotey stated that the plans indicate that the lot coverage will be 42.3%.

Board Member Semmelman stated that it might be easier to support if there was an engineering plan in place to address storm water management.

Mr. Lyons stated that the plan will be to manage the storm water in accordance to the ordinances that are in place.

Board Member Krummick stated that he is concerned that any new development may not be consistent with the small lot character of the neighborhood.

Board Member Schultz asked Mr. Lyons who he is working with on this project. Mr. Lyons stated that he is working with the owner of the property and with the contractor, Mr. Richter, but the plans for the new house are not drawn yet. He stated that if their requests are not approved then they may consider remodeling the existing house in order to plat two conforming lots relative to the minimum required width.

Mr. Gene Maher, 318 Elm Court, owner of the subject site and petitioner, stated that he is highly sensitive to the Heritage District. He stated that he wants to be friendly and sensitive to his neighbors. He stated that he is sensitive of the water issues.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 12 of 13

Board Member Schultz asked the owner if he will continue to reside in his home. Mr. Maher stated that it is his intent to remain in his home for the time being.

Board Member Schultz stated that he is supportive of the subdivision provided that they are compliant with adequate storm water management and detention standards regulated by the Village. He asked Mr. Lyons if he would be willing to re-work the proposed platted property line in order to meet the minimum required lot width. Mr. Lyons stated that they studied alternative line configurations and consulted with Village Staff. He stated that in the end the current proposal seemed to be the best alternative.

Board Member Moore stated that the utility infrastructure was designed for lots that are 50 feet in width and may not be able to accommodate larger lots. He stated that this may be an unknown with further study.

Mr. Lyons stated that the intent of the zoning requests is to preserve a 1910 residence. He asked if he could poll the Zoning Board of Appeals before they take formal action of making a recommendation to the Village Board.

Chairman Cotey stated that without an actual plan for the vacant lot it is difficult to make a recommendation.

Board Member Oakley stated that he is okay with the requests.

Board Member Flores stated that she is okay with the requests.

Board Member Moore stated that he does not support the requests as he is concerned about setting precedence and with the water issues.

Board Member Semmelman stated that he is okay with the requests.

Board Member Krummick stated that does not support the requests as he feels that this difficulty in being compliant with the Zoning Code is a self-created hardship and that he is concerned with the capacity and condition of the existing infrastructure of the utilities.

Board Member Shultz stated that he is okay with the requests.

In the matter of ZBA 15-33, Board Member Schultz moved, seconded by Board Member Flores, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a variation to reduce the minimum required lot width from 60 feet to approximately 57.3 feet in order to resubdivide Lots 10 and 11 located in the J. Eli Triggs Subdivision in an R-6, Single Family Residential District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 2.

Minutes of the December 14, 2015, Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Page 13 of 13

Ayes: Cotey, Flores, Oakley, Schultz, Semmelman

Nays: Krummick, Moore

Absent: None

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Mr. Spoden stated that bids to contractors will go out this week in regards to the development of the new parking garage.

Board Member Moore moved, seconded by Board Member Semmelman, to adjourn the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Motion carried 7 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.