

1  
2  
3 **VILLAGE OF HINSDALE**  
4 **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
5 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**  
6 **July 20, 2016**  
7

8 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

9 Chairman Bob Neiman called the regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning  
10 Board of Appeals to order Wednesday, July 20, 2016 at 6:35 p.m. in Memorial  
11 Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.  
12

13 **2. ROLL CALL**

14 **Present:** Members Marc Connelly, Gary Moberly, Keith Giltner, Rody Biggert,  
15 Kathryn Engel, John Podliska and Chairman Bob Neiman  
16

17 **Absent:** None  
18

19 **Also Present:** Director of Community Development/Building Commissioner  
20 Robb McGinnis and Village Clerk Christine Bruton  
21

22 **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

23 a) **Regular meeting of June 15, 2016**

24 Member Connelly noted a date error in the minutes. Member Moberly  
25 moved to **approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 15, 2016,**  
26 **as amended.** Member Engel seconded the motion.  
27

28 **AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and  
29 Chairman Neiman

30 **NAYS:** None

31 **ABSTAIN:** None

32 **ABSENT:** None  
33

34 Motion carried.  
35

36 **4. APPROVAL OF FINAL DECISION – None**  
37

38 **5. RECEIPT OF APPEARANCES**

39 All persons intending to speak at the public hearings were sworn in by the  
40 court reporter.  
41

42 **6. RECEIPT OF REQUESTS, MOTIONS, PLEADINGS, OR REQUESTS TO**  
43 **MAKE PUBLIC COMMENT OF A GENERAL NATURE – None**  
44

45 **7. PRE-HEARING AND AGENDA SETTING – None**  
46

47 **8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1 a) **V-03-16, 223 N. Garfield Street**

2 Ms. Beth Flaming addressed the Board, stating she has been the owner of  
3 the property for 13 years. The home is 100 years old, and she has spent a  
4 great deal of time, effort and money to improve and restore the property.  
5 She is asking for a variance for a new three-car garage, and indicated the  
6 elevations supplied to the Board that illustrate an attractive, appropriate  
7 garage. She explained the hardship as a result of complying with code  
8 due to the width of yard and the required 11' foot setback. The lot is  
9 unusually deep, much more so than her neighbors. The new garage will be  
10 further back in the yard, and would align with another in the neighborhood.  
11 If it were placed according to code in the back 20% of the lot, it would be  
12 over 140' feet from her back door. She commented this would make it very  
13 difficult to shovel snow. The lot is 9' feet wider in the front than the back,  
14 and because of the location of the house on the lot, there aren't any other  
15 options for locating the garage. The architect made every effort to figure  
16 out an alternative location. The footprint of the new garage is 32' feet wide,  
17 but comes in 4' feet on each side at the back for the storage area. Without  
18 relief, she would end up with a garage in the middle of the back yard, which  
19 would ruin the view and create unusable tracts of land on each side and at  
20 the back of the garage. They have proposed a two-foot setback, because  
21 that is the requirement if it were in the back 20% of the lot. Ms. Flaming  
22 provided statements of approval from her neighbors. It was confirmed that  
23 building a two-car garage, instead of a three-car garage would not change  
24 the need for this variation. Mr. McGinnis stated that FAR and lot coverage  
25 bulk regulations will be confirmed.

26 Member Giltner moved to **close the public hearing for V-03-16, 223 N.**  
27 **Garfield Street.** Member Connelly seconded the motion.  
28

29 **AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and  
30 Chairman Neiman

31 **NAYS:** None

32 **ABSTAIN:** None

33 **ABSENT:** None  
34

35 Motion carried.  
36  
37

38 **DELIBERATIONS**  
39

40 Chairman Neiman opened discussion. Member Engel stated her concern  
41 would have been the three-car request, but that is not the issue in this case.  
42 Chairman Neiman stated he believes all the criteria have been met for those  
43 reasons detailed in the application. Member Moberly pointed out there is still a  
44 lot of yard left, and this garage does not infringe on the neighbors. Member  
45 Engel moved to **approve the variation request known as V-03-16, 223 N.**  
46 **Garfield Street.** Member Connelly seconded the motion.

1  
2 **AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and  
3 Chairman Neiman

4 **NAYS:** None

5 **ABSTAIN:** None

6 **ABSENT:** None

7  
8 Motion carried.

9  
10  
11 **b) V-04-16, 33 S. Monroe Street**

12 Mr. Robert Saunders, homeowner, provided background for the Board as it  
13 relates to the replacement of his 85-year old dilapidated, beyond repair  
14 garage and shed. Currently, the garage is too shallow for modern cars,  
15 and has no architectural significance. He noted both are legal non-  
16 conforming structures. The proposed garage will replace both of those,  
17 reduce the existing non-conformity, and the design is consistent with  
18 neighborhood.

19 He is asking for relief of the side yard setback. He would like to put the  
20 garage closer to the north lot line, specifically 5' feet off the north lot line.  
21 The zoning code would require 8.5' feet off the lot line. He said it is worth  
22 noting the property is otherwise within code.

23 If the garage was placed according to code, the garage would be 3' feet off  
24 the alley, and there would be no way to see when backing out.  
25 Additionally, there is a utility pole on the northern property line, which  
26 would be difficult to navigate. Mr. McGinnis noted the alley drive aisle is  
27 about 8' feet, which is very narrow.

28 Mr. Saunders explained they are also motivated to relocate the garage to  
29 protect two mature spruce trees on the property. Their arborist concluded  
30 the trees would be at risk if locating the garage according to code. He  
31 believes the age and condition of the garage, the proximity of significant  
32 trees, and the narrowness of the alley are not self-created, and existed at  
33 time of purchase. He believes losing the trees would be a detriment to  
34 them and neighborhood. He addressed each of the approval criteria and  
35 provided letters of approval from his neighbors. He confirmed they have no  
36 plans to remove the spruce trees. Member Podliska moved to **close the**  
37 **public hearing for V-04-16, 33 S. Monroe Street.** Member Biggert  
38 seconded the motion.

39  
40 **AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and  
41 Chairman Neiman

42 **NAYS:** None

43 **ABSTAIN:** None

44 **ABSENT:** None

45  
46 Motion carried.

**DELIBERATIONS**

Chairman Neiman commented this applicant, and the previous applicant, did an exceptional job addressing the approval criteria. He believes that all criteria for this case were met, and is completely consistent with the code. The Board concurred. Member Moberly moved **to approve the variation request known as V-04-16, 33 S. Monroe Street**. Member Biggert seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and Chairman Neiman

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried

**9. NEW BUSINESS** – None

**10. OTHER BUSINESS** – None

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Engel made a motion to **adjourn the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of July 20, 2016**. Member Moberly seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Members Connelly, Moberly, Giltner, Biggert, Engel, Podliska and Chairman Neiman

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried.

Chairman Neiman declared the meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christine M. Bruton  
Village Clerk

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_