

MINUTES
Glen Ellyn Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Tuesday, June 11, 2024 at 7:00 PM
Glen Ellyn Civic Center
Galligan Board Room
535 Duane Street

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Member Jones called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM and stated that he was filling in for Chairperson Constantino this evening. He explained the advisory nature of the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and its process for deliberation and recommendation. He described the Public Hearing protocols and announced that the meeting was being recorded.

Roll was called.

Present: Members Katie Crudele, Members Matthew Jones, Christiane McKnight and Craig Pavlich.

Absent: Chairperson Gregory Constantino, Reed Panther and Thomas Whalls.

Also in attendance: Daniel Harper, Planning Manager; Anne Gould, Village Trustee and Julie Settles, Recording Secretary.

Member McKnight made a motion to appoint Member Jones to Chairperson for tonight's meeting; seconded by Member Pavlich, the motion passed by voice vote

B. Public Comment (non-agenda items)

None

C. Approval of Minutes

Member McKnight made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the May 14, 2024 ZBA meeting; seconded by Member Pavlich, the motion passed by voice vote.

D. New Business

1. Public Hearing – 562 Hillside Avenue

Member Crudele moved to open the Public Hearing. Member Pavlich seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Sworn in, Daniel Harper, Planning Manager for the Village of Glen Ellyn, introduced the request: Zoning Variation requests to allow for a corner side yard setback of twenty feet (20') in lieu of the required minimum thirty-foot (30') corner side yard setback at 562 Hillside Avenue. Mr. Harper stated that the project is located on what is legally two lots commonly known as 562 Hillside Avenue. The property is located on the northeast corner of Hillside Avenue and Forest Avenue. The property is approximately 96' in length and 150' in width and will have a total lot area of approximately 14,369 square feet once the two properties are consolidated together as part of a proposed building permit application. The property is zoned R2 Single Family Residential which requires that single family buildings have a 30-foot side yard setback. In the case of this property, the side yard setback would face Forest Avenue. The variation requested for this property is a variation from Section 10-4-8(E) to allow for a reduced side yard setback of 20' in lieu of the required 30-foot side yard setback to accommodate the new construction of a proposed 3,647 square foot one-story home. Mr. Harper showed the site plan showing conformance with front yard, rear yard and interior side yard setbacks as well as lot coverage requirements. The drawing shows the proposed variation as a dotted redline showing the 20-foot setback. The blue area on the drawing would be the area of the building within the required 30-foot side yard setback. Approximately 950 square feet of the home, including a portion of the garage, a bedroom and a bathroom. The applicant has reported in their application that the need for this variation was to accommodate for topography of the property which includes approximately 8 feet of elevation change within the effected building area. Preserving existing trees on the property was also raised as a concern for this variation application. The applicant has submitted a signed petition from the property owner of 551 Hillside Ave in support of the application and Mr. Harper received a letter of support from 555 Hillside earlier today. Mr. Harper stated that the ZBA should consider the testimony presented during the public hearing and review the written evidence presented as part of the petitioner's application packet. The ZBA should make finding of fact and determine if practical difficulty or a particular hardship exists in accordance with Section 10-10-12 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.

Member Pavlich asked that with the consolidation, will it be filed in Glen Ellyn or DuPage County. Mr. Harper answered that if everything is up to code, the Village of Glen Ellyn would sign and approve and file it at DuPage County.

Sworn in, Raymond Whalen of Ray Whalen Builders, Inc., 177 Sunset Avenue, Glen Ellyn. Mr. Whalen thanked the Commission for allowing the presentation. He stated that he couldn't but the approach on Hillside due to the 4" grade change. He stated the home that is being proposed will keep the character of the neighborhood. He stated that they met with the neighbors and would like to keep their distance from them. They also want to keep the mature trees along the east lot line separating the two lots.

Member Pavlich asked how many properties are not conforming as far as setbacks. Mr. Harper answered that he couldn't give a definite answer as to how many. Member Pavlich then asked what other plans were considered to work within the Village Code. Mr. Whalen stated that they did create another plan but did not have the plans with them. He stated it was the same house, but after talking with the neighbors, they wanted to keep their distance between them. Mr. Whalen also stated the plans have an elevated because there are several steps from the garage to the house and it's very difficult to put a ranch house on a lot that fits the Code. Mr. Pavlich then asked if when

the house was built it was built to code. Mr. Harper answered that he doesn't know of any variances on this property. Member Pavlich asked if the current house is 20' off lot line on Forest. Mr. Whalen answered that it was 18.73' on one corner and 19.35 on the other. They want to push it back about a foot.

Sworn in, Jamie Martin 417 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn, stated that she lives next door to the property and that she is in attendance to support the project. She stated that the proposed home isn't going to look much different. Member Jones asked when the new home faces Forest if Ms. Martin thought it would be beneficial. Ms. Martin stated that they'd have more trick or treaters.

Sworn in, Lincoln Bole 566 Hillside Avenue, Glen Ellyn, thanked Ralph and Amy and welcomed them to the neighborhood and thanked them for talking to him and his wife regarding the proposed home. He stated that he supports the project.

Sworn in, Gail Bole 566 Hillside, Glen Ellyn, stated she was also in support of the project. She stated that her home is old so she understands the need for architecture and ambiance and believes this change will support that. She stated that the architectural design will complement the area.

Member Crudele made a motion to close the Public Hearing for 562 Hillside Avenue. Member Pavlich seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member Crudele read the findings of fact:

1. Due to the characteristics of the property in question, there are practical difficulties or particular hardship for the applicant/owner in carrying out the strict letter of the Zoning Code, because the subject property has topographical conditions that have impacted the proposed location of the new construction and that the proposed new construction would be a similar distance to the eastern property line as the existing home and would protect several large trees on the property.
2. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Code because the intention of the applicant is to maintain the character of the neighborhood and protect the trees of the property despite the topographic conditions.
3. The plight of the applicant/owner is due to unique circumstances relating to the property in question because of the topography.
4. The requested variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality of the property in question because the proposed home is intended to match the character of the neighborhood and reduce the impact on the neighboring property to the east.
5. The particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the property in question would bring particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the Zoning Code were to be carried out because the property's topography creates practical difficulties and the development would require an interior side yard setback that would negatively impact the eastern property respective to height, light and air ventilation.
6. The conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district because the property's topography

restricts practical building area and would be better served with the character of the community with a reduced corner side yard setback.

7. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property in question because the intention of the construction is maintaining the character of the existing neighborhood and protect trees on the property.

8. The alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property in question or by the applicant because the topography was not created by any person having an interest in the property.

9. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property in question is located and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property because the proposed corner side-yard setback allows for the new home to create distance between the home east of the property and improves stormwater management.

10. The proposed variation will not subsequently increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to the property in question or adjacent property because the proposed building will meet all applicable Building and Fire Codes.

11. The proposed variation will not otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village; diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; or unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways because the proposed home is for the residential use of the current property owners.

12. The proposed variation will not create a nuisance or result in an increase in public expenditures because the proposed home is for the residential use of the current property owners and is not anticipated to negatively impact neighbors.

13. The variation is the minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure because the proposed variation will make it possible to reasonably develop the property with its topographical challenges and will have a minimum impact on adjacent properties.

Member Pavlich made a motion to adopt the “(Draft) Findings of Fact to Support a motion to recommend approval of a zoning variations to allow the construction of a single-family structure with a corner side yard setback of twenty feet (20’) in lieu of the required minimum thirty-foot (30’) corner side setback in the R2 district for the property located at 562 Hillside Avenue, Glen Ellyn, IL. Member McKnight seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting “Yes”, Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

Member McKnight stated she’s in favor because it seems like a unique challenge for the property and three neighbors are in support of the project.

Member Crudele stated that she agreed with Member McKnight.

Member Pavlich stated that he struggles with this one because there may be other options that were not explored that don’t involve changing the code.

Member Jones stated that if they were going to build two homes we’d be here with different variations. He stated he was in favor because they are replacing the existing structure with a few

changes. He stated this will be a great house for the next one hundred years. He stated that it would be nice to have everything fit, yes, but looking at the entire package, he's ok with it. Member Pavlich asked what was needed for the vote to pass. He stated his concern is giving a variance just because it looks nice. He's concerned about massaging the Code for others in the future. He also stated that in this case he'll vote in favor but don't take it for granted that the Board will keep granting for new construction.

Board Recommendation

Member McKnight moved for the following:

Having considered the application of Ralph Lauterbach and Amy Stoeffler, owners of the property at 562 Hillside Avenue, Glen Ellyn, for zoning variations from Section 10-4-8(E)1 to allow for a corner side yard setback of twenty (20') in lieu of the required minimum of thirty-foot (30') corner side yard setback, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby adopts the findings of fact in the petitioners' application packet and presented by the petitioners at the Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing conducted on June 11, 2024, as well as the findings included in the deliberations of the Zoning Board of Appeals and recommends approval based upon the following hardships or unique circumstances:

The topographical conditions of the property are due to a significant slope. The homeowners prefer the ranch style of home, and the warrant footprint is under the lot coverage allotted. Member Pavlich noted visually there is more green space. Jamie Martin spoke during public comment that she is in favor of the construction. Lincoln and Gale Bole noted that neighbors are supportive, and they are appreciative the petitioners spoke with them first. The homeowners recognize the importance of keeping the character of the neighborhood.

Member Crudele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting "Yes": Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

2. Public Hearing – 574 Raintree Drive

Member Pavlich moved to open the Public Hearing. Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Mr. Harper stated the applicant is requesting to allow for a variation in the Village's lot coverage requirement for construction of a 240 square foot gazebo in the backyard of 574 Raintree Dr. The property is located near the northwest corner of Raintree Drive and Prince Edward Road and has a total area of 9,375 square feet in area. The property is zoned R2 Single-family residential which requires a maximum lot coverage ratios for single-family dwellings with more than one story and accessory buildings of 20%. The applicant is proposing a variation to Section 10-4-8 (E)1 to allow for a lot coverage ratio of 24.6% in lieu of the required 20% maximum lot coverage allowed. The proposed gazebo would be 240 square feet with the dimensions of 12 x 20 feet and a height of 10.2 feet. The proposed gazebo would be in compliance with Glen Ellyn's gazebo requirements located in Section 10-5-4(B)4-16, however the property currently has an

existing lot coverage of 22% which was a product of its original construction. The home is approximately 2,066.65 square feet and was constructed in 1972. The property would not be allowed to accommodate any more additions, primary or accessory, without a variation from the lot coverage requirement. The exception to this, is that single-family residences constructed in the R2 zoning district are granted an allowance of up to 100 square feet for the construction of an accessory structure, except a detached garage, notwithstanding the existing lot coverage ratio provide that the total lot coverage ratio shall be no more than 25% for a single-family dwelling. Said single accessory structure shall have a peaked roof with a ridge height of nine feet or less and be constructed so that no wall of the structure is more than 12 feet in length. (10-5-4 (A)2 (b)) – Accessory Structure and Uses) The proposed gazebo could be constructed in compliance with this regulation and not require a variation if reduced in size and height. The applicants have submitted a petition of twelve neighbors supporting the application. Mr. Harper stated that the ZBA should make findings of fact and determine if practical difficulty or a particular hardship exists in accordance with Section 1-10-12 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.

Sworn in, Stephen Mahalick, owner of 574 Raintree Drive, thanked the Commission for their time and for reviewing their application. Mr. Mahalick stated they are a young family of five and love living in Glen Ellyn. He stated the home was built with a lot ratio of 22% preventing them from adding a structure. Without a variance, he'd have to tear down a portion of his home.

Sworn in, Nina Mahalick, owner of 574 Raintree Drive, stated that with three small children they have family over a lot. There is minimal shade in the yard for elderly parents and young kids. She also stated she has twelve signatures from neighbors in favor of the gazebo. She stated that they are trying to do everything the right way and the character of the neighborhood will be maintained.

Member Jones asked if there were any trees in the backyard. Mr. Mahalick answered there was one tree in the way back of the yard. Member Jones stated that he noticed the Maple in the yard and believes it needs to be torn down. He asked if they had looked at any landscaping. Mr. Mahalick answered that they were open to the idea but hadn't looked into it.

Member Pavlich stated that there was no shade in the back and asked Mr. Mahalick how he knew he'd need a variance. Mr. Mahalick answered that he had gone back and read Board Minutes from 2006.

Member Crudele asked what the dimensions were. Mr. Mahalick answered 12x20. Member Crudele asked if they looked at a smaller footprint. Mr. Mahalick answered that with a growing family and having lots of family over a 10x10 isn't going to help.

Member Crudele read the findings of fact:

1. Due to the characteristics of the property in question, there are practical difficulties or particular hardship for the applicant/owner in carrying out the strict letter of the Zoning Code, because the subject property was constructed with a lot coverage of 22% preventing the possibility of having an accessory structure of the desired size in the R2 Residential Zoning District.

2. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Code because the applicant will not be able to construct a freestanding accessory structure of the desired height and area.
3. The plight of the applicant/owner is due to unique circumstances relating to the property in question because the topography.
4. The requested variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality of the property in question because the proposed structure will not be visible from the street and will meet village and county stormwater permits.
5. The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the property in question would bring particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the Zoning Code were to be carried out because the subject property was constructed with a lot coverage of 22% preventing the possibility of having an accessory structure of the desired size in the R2 Residential Zoning District.
6. The conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district because the subject property was originally constructed with a lot coverage ratio of 22%.
7. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property in question because the applicant does not intend to profit from the construction of the accessory structure.
8. The alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property in question or by the applicant because the lot was not created by any person having an interest in the property
9. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property in question is located and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property because the proposed accessory structure will meet all other village setback and bulk requirements for gazebos in the R2 Residential Zoning District.
10. The proposed variation will not subsequently increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to the property in question or adjacent property because the proposed building will meet all applicable Building and Fire Codes.
11. The proposed variation will not otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village; diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; or unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways because the proposed accessory structure is for the use of the current property owners.
12. The proposed variation will not create a nuisance or result in an increase in public expenditures because the proposed home is for the residential use of the current property owners and is not anticipated to negatively impact neighbors.
13. The variation is the minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure because the subject property was constructed with a lot coverage of 22% preventing the possibility of having an accessory structure of the desired size in the R2 Residential Zoning District.

Member Pavlich made a motion to adopt the “(Draft) Findings of Fact to Support a motion to recommend approval of a zoning variations to allow a lot coverage ratio of 24.6 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent maximum lot coverage allowed in the R2 district for the property located at 574 Raintree Dr., Glen Ellyn, IL. Member McKnight seconded the

motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting “Yes”, Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

Member Jones stated he was in favor of the variation. He stated during COVID the Commission approved two to four of these same projects and denied one because they built it without permission. He stated it’s a nicer approach to have a more permanent structure other than an umbrella.

Member Pavlich stated he is in favor due to the hardship based on the code change.

Member Crudele stated she was in favor also because of the code change.

Member McKnight stated she was also in favor because it will allow the owners the best use of their property.

Member Crudele made a motion to close the Public Hearing for 574 Raintree Dr. Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member McKnight moved for the following:

Having considered the application of Stephen and Nina Mahalick, owners of the property at 574 Raintree Drive, Glen Ellyn, for zoning a variation to allow for a lot coverage ratio of 24.6 percent in lieu of the required 20 percent maximum lot coverage allowed. The Zoning Board of Appeals hereby adopts the findings of fact in the petitioners’ application packet and presented by the petitioners at the Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing conducted on June 11, 2024.

Member Crudele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting “Yes”: Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

3. Public Hearing – 171 Brandon Avenue

Member Crudele moved to open the Public Hearing. Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Mr. Harper stated the applicant is requesting to allow for a zoning variation on Section 10-5-4(A)2(a) to allow for a freestanding accessory structure (detached garage) to occupy thirty-three percent (or 660 square feet) of the required area in lieu of the thirty percent maximum area allowed. The subject property and the adjacent properties are all zoned R2 Single-family residential and are improved with single family homes. The property is fifty feet in width and 204.5 feet in length with a total area of 10,454 square feet. The purpose of the garage will be for the storage of three vehicles and yard equipment per the application of the petitioner. The Village did receive two pieces of correspondence in support of the variance. The ZBA may choose to make a recommendation to the Village Board for the approval, approval with conditions or denial of the variation to allow the construction of the proposed addition in accordance with Section 10-10-12 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.

Member Pavlich stated that ZBA's job is to assist if there becomes a disagreement in the Village Code and there is nothing on the Village website to request a hearing. He stated that this happened to his variance and asked where you can find on the Village website required rear yard. He stated that currently required rear yards is interpreted as the minimum required area of the rear yard that is bound by the required rear setback line and the property lines. When the rear setback is used as a boundary only the rearmost forty feet of the rear yard is included in the coverage calculation. Required rear yard as found in the code is not a specifically defined term and should only be applied to corner lots and not for interior lots. 171 Brandon Avenue is not a corner lot. The required rear yard should be interpreted as yard, rear which is the open space extending the full width of the lot between the closest point of the principal building and rear lot line. He stated he'd like to have clarification, so the ZBA doesn't keep going through this if it is not necessary and doesn't know how to proceed.

Mr. Harper stated to submit a recommendation to him, and it can be placed on an agenda at a future ZBA meeting.

Member McKnight stated that it was a good idea to present this at another ZBA meeting and for now this case needs to be moved along.

Sworn in, Timothy Stroh, owner of 171 Brandon Avenue, thanked the Commission for their time and for reviewing their application. Mr. Stroh stated that he has lived in Glen Ellyn all his life except for when he was in the service. His mother ran the bookstore. He needs the new garage to store items because he has a smaller home that he does not plan on making bigger. His neighbors to the north and south do not have any issues with the garage. He stated that there are three adult drivers in the car and needs a three-car garage. He also stated that his wife passed away in the garage and it's a constant reminder and a new garage would alleviate that.

Sworn in, David Krecek, Blue Sky Builders, stated that he agreed with Member Pavlich regarding the code language. He stated that when the ordinance was drafted, he believes an error was made in the language. When building in the rear yard, Western Springs and Naperville have a different ordinance.

Sworn in, Ray Whalen, 177 Sunset Ave., stated that he built a home two doors down from Mr. Stroh and building and zoning officials met as a group and came to a resolution. He stated our zoning code is extremely difficult to interpret. He applauded Mr. Harper for his knowledge in the short amount of time he's been in Glen Ellyn. He stated he believes it should go to the Plan Commission.

Member McKnight read the findings of fact:

1. Due to the characteristics of the property in question, there are practical difficulties or particular hardship for the applicant/owner in carrying out the strict letter of the Zoning Code, because the subject property is narrow and limited in area preventing the maximum allowable detached garage size of 660 square feet in the R2 Residential Zoning District.

2. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Code because the applicant will not be able to construct the maximum allowable size for a detached garage.
3. The plight of the applicant/owner is due to unique circumstances relating to the property in question because the property is narrow and limited in area preventing the maximum allowable detached garage size of 660 square feet.
4. The requested variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality of the property in question because the proposed garage will not be visible from the street and will meet village and county stormwater permits.
5. The particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical condition of the property in question would bring particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the Zoning Code were to be carried out because the subject property is narrow and limited in area preventing the maximum allowable detached garage size of 660 square feet in the R2 Residential Zoning District.
6. The conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district because the subject property is narrow and limited in area preventing the maximum allowable detached garage size of 660 square feet in the R2 Residential Zoning District.
7. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property in question because the applicant does not intend to profit from the construction of the detached garage.
8. The alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property in question or by the applicant because the lot was not created by any person having an interest in the property
9. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property in question is located and will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property because the proposed garage will meet all other village setback and bulk requirements for detached garages in the R2 Residential Zoning District.
10. The proposed variation will not subsequently increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to the property in question or adjacent property because the proposed building will meet all applicable Building and Fire Codes.
11. The proposed variation will not otherwise impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village; diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; or unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways because the proposed detached garage is for the use of the current property owners.
12. The proposed variation will not create a nuisance or result in an increase in public expenditures because the proposed detached garage is for the use of the current property owners and is not anticipated to negatively impact neighbors.
13. The variation is the minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure because the subject property is narrow and limited in area preventing the maximum allowable detached garage size of 660 square feet in the R2 Residential Zoning District.

Member McKnight made a motion to adopt the “(Draft) Findings of Fact to Support a motion to recommend approval of a zoning variations to allow the construction of a free-

standing accessory structure to occupy thirty-three percent of the required rear yard in lieu of the thirty percent maximum allowed area in the R2 district for the property located at 171Bradon Avenue, Glen Ellyn, IL. Member Pavlich seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting “Yes”, Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

Member McKnight stated she was in favor because it seems to be a modest ask and will meet the needs of the family.

Member Crudele stated she was in favor and supports the variation.

Member Pavlich stated he was in favor. He stated that he’s motivated that the code is fair to everyone. He stated he was in favor, but he doesn’t believe the petitioner needs the variance.

Member Jones stated he was also in favor, and it will be a great asset to the Village.

Member Crudele made a motion to close the Public Hearing for 171 Brandon Avenue. Member Pavlich seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote.

Member McKnight moved for the following:

Having considered the application of Timothy Stroh, owners of the property at 171 Brandon Avenue, Glen Ellyn, for zoning a variation from Section 10-5-4(A)2(a) to allow for a freestanding accessory structure to occupy thirty-three percent of the required rear yard area in lieu of the thirty percent maximum area allowed, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby adopts the findings of fact in the petitioners’ application packet and presented by the petitioners at the Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing conducted on June 11, 2024.

Member Crudele seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote with four Members present voting “Yes”: Crudele, Jones, McKnight and Pavlich.

E. Other Business

None.

F. Chairperson’s Statement

None.

G. Trustee Liaison’s Report

Trustee Gould stated that the hotel parcel east of the plaza will be demolished. She also stated the Village received notice that two grants have been requested.

H. Staff Report

Mr. Harper stated two cases are in the works for a future ZBA meeting. Member Jones stated that the ZBA has two vacancies. Member Crudele stated that she is also stepping down but will stay for a few more months. Mr. Harper stated that every member has to show up so there can be a meeting. He also stated the members could encourage other people to apply. Member Jones asked if there is any training. Trustee Gould stated that there is.

I. Adjournment

Member Pavlich made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Member McKnight seconded the motion and the motion passed by voice vote at 9:11 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Settles