

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 1119 SOUTH SALEM LANE - ZBA #25-034

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, I'm calling this month's Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

Can we start with roll call?

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Selbka.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Mr. O'Connor.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Siavelis.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Here.

Next, we will do the Pledge of Allegiance. Everybody stand, face the rear of the room.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, next, we'll approve the minutes from last month's meeting.

Did the Board members have an opportunity to review those minutes, and are there any changes or edits which are required?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: None heard.

Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, I'm going to over the procedure hearing, hearing procedures rather.

So, first, quorum. If less than six members are present, there is the option to petitioners to continue the meeting. It takes four affirmative votes to approve a variance regardless of the number of Board members in attendance. If denied, a petitioner cannot reapply for a whole year. So, as you can see, we have four tonight. So, in order to get your petition granted, you're going to need to go four for four.

The variation hardship. So, it's incumbent upon the petitioner to explain the four elements necessary to establish order for this Board to be able to grant a variation. Those elements are:

1. That the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property;
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances which may include the

APPROVED

- length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned;
3. That the proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this chapter; and
 4. That the variation requested is the minimum variation necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

A variation shall be permitted only if the evidence, in the judgment of the Board of Appeals, sustains each of the four conditions enumerated. So, folks, we've received your packets, we've read them, but it is still incumbent upon you to explain why you're here, what is it you're asking for, and why you're asking for it. If you explain those four things, it makes it a lot easier for this Board to potentially grant your petition.

The agenda item. The Chairperson will open the agenda item and provide introductory remarks. It will then be followed by a Staff presentation which is a brief overview of the project and the variance request. The applicant will then present its case in favor of zoning relief by way of documents or testimony. The applicants and any witnesses testifying must be sworn under oath and must state and spell their respective names for the record.

Public comment. Members of the public may speak on the application. Speakers must be sworn under oath and state and spell their name clearly. Anyone who is formally registered in advance of the hearing as an objector should be permitted to speak first. Objectors must complete a form to be provided by the Department of Community Development and submitted to the Director of Community Development not later than 4:30 p.m. five days before the scheduled date of the hearing.

A registered objector may cross examine the applicant or their witness. Registered objectors are also not restricted to the time limit for public comment. Any person who is not formally registered as an objector may speak at the hearing but must limit their comments to three minutes. The Chair may, in his discretion, alter the maximum time provided to public commenters provided the maximum time is applied to all speakers.

The applicant may make a closing statement and may present any follow-up testimony or evidence. The applicant then rests their case. The Board will make a motion to close public testimony by voice vote. The Board deliberates and votes on the matter. All ZBA final decisions must be in writing. If the agenda packet does not include a draft final order that is acceptable to the ZBA, the substantive motion should be to direct Staff to prepare an appropriate final order for approval at a subsequent meeting.

Dan, could you go to the meeting agenda? I just want to make a distinction between public comments on the petitions and public comments in general.

Okay, so folks, what I just described would be public comments germane to each of the agenda items. If you want to speak about those petitions, that's what I just covered in the public comments. There is a separate public comment section at the very end. That is to allow anybody who has anything they would like to speak as their right of the public to do so. I'm pointing out this distinction because, again, if you come up to speak to any of the petitions, we're asking that you have your comments be specific to that petition and not a general comment about Village affairs, the Chicago Bears, et cetera.

At that point, we'll see if there's other business and we'll motion for adjournment.

APPROVED

With that said, let's start with New Business, Agenda Item A. 1119 South Salem Lane, ZBA Petition #25-034.

MR. SHAW: Can I approach?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, come on up.

MR. SHAW: Perfect. Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Good evening. Could you state your name and address for the record?

MR. SHAW: Yes. Good evening, I'm Ryan Shaw, 1119 South Salem Lane.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. OSOBA: All right, the property at 1119 South Salem Lane is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to expand an existing 22-foot-wide asphalt driveway on the property to a maximum width of 29 feet in order to park additional vehicles in the driveway. The driveway that is proposed is to be tapered with the width remaining 22 feet at the sidewalk and expanding to 29 feet as it gets closer to the two-car garage. The maximum driveway width for two-car garages is 22 feet.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A seven-foot variance from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-11.1(b) to allow a driveway width of 29 feet where 22 feet is the maximum.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. SHAW: Yes, so as Dan just said, all we're asking for is a taper at the top of the driveway, just seven feet additional driveway space. The intent is to allow us to keep the driveway clean, organized, and mostly a safety thing. We have young children who are active in sports in school, and we constantly have other families approaching the house, other vehicles there whether for sports or what have you. Reversing a large SUV out of the garage while maneuvering out around a parked vehicle in the driveway just becomes burdensome.

So, unless you have any questions, I'm going to go to the four elements right now. The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality. I think more important than what I think, what you want to hear is what our neighbors think. So, what we did is we went around to all of the impacted neighbors, showed them the mockup of what we're proposing to do, and we got unanimous support from everyone I talked to. I believe that should have been provided, you know, the support for all that.

I think really the driving factor is, I also submitted some images.

Dan, I don't know if you can cycle through those, or I have printed copies if it's much easier.

This is an example of a driveway that's got a similar addition. Here's another one. You know, I got feedback from the Zoning Board that there's concerns it would be unattractive. You know, I don't think this is unattractive.

This is an example of how we got the unanimous support. This is 1109 South Salem, this is two doors down from us, identical width driveway, similar house. You can see they a pad there, so we don't have a pad but we do have frequently have three vehicles on the driveway. You can see the Cadillac there on the right, it's parked on the grass. This causes kind of unsightly, it kills the grass, right, the vehicle parked on the grass. The other safety thing is there's a vehicle you can see obstructing the sidewalk which isn't ideal, and I think that's against the rules as well.

So, the result of this is they often have, you know, vehicles

APPROVED

obstructing the sidewalk, vehicles on the street. It causes some issues when the, you know, snowplows are out. So, really that's the intent of really the variance we're asking for.

Unless there are any questions, I'm going to roll through all the other elements.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Keep rolling.

MR. SHAW: Another one is it's got to be within the harmony and spirit of the intent of the rules. You know, I think the intent of the Zoning Code, we can all agree, is making safe, attractive and functional neighborhoods. I think by, you know, allowing, you know, a seven-foot variance, it's really the minimal ask that allows the enhanced safety for children and pedestrians, right, you know, as we're reversing out of the driveway, not having to steer around parked vehicles. I think evidenced by the fact that, you know, we've gotten a unanimous support from the neighbors, it's going to improve the aesthetics and curb appeal, you know, if we can prevent vehicles from being on the grass, the sidewalk or the street.

I think the third element, the minimum variance, you know, some of the pictures that Dan showed, you know, I think these are tasteful. You know, they didn't ask for a third stall or anything, right, just an additional parking space again to safely park a vehicle to the side. You know, homes more than 50 years old, the needs and sizes of, you know, family vehicles has evolved. I think it's the minimum ask in order for the house to meet our needs.

Then the last is the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances. The reality is I married an Iowa girl, so our family lives all out of state, and they're constantly coming to visit whether I like it or not. So, we frequently get out-of-state visitors and we do have overnight guests, right, as much as I joke. So, it is fairly common that we'll have two to three vehicles parked in the driveway, so I think by granting this variance, it allows us to keep, you know, the intent of the neighborhood which is clean and organized driveways and curb appeal.

I think that's it. I'm going to open up for questions.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I have a few for you. So, first of all, how long have you been in the house?

MR. SHAW: Five years.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Five years. How many people live there?

MR. SHAW: Four.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And number of drivers?

MR. SHAW: Two for now.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Two for now. How old are your kids?

Ballpark?

MR. SHAW: I'm sorry, I'm wondering at the relevance.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Just trying to understand.

MR. SHAW: They're six and seven.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it, okay.

Question for Staff, just the request here is for a seven-foot addition I think on the north side if I remember correctly, right?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: There's about 14 or 15 feet there currently.

APPROVED

Would there be a variance required should we grant that? I mean do they have enough setback?

MR. OSOBA: With the space between the driveway and the property line?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And the property line, correct.

MR. OSOBA: There is no additional variance that would need to be granted for that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it, okay. Those are my questions at this point.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Tom or Frank?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: The neighbor immediately to the north, you have their approval on one of these letters?

MR. SHAW: Yes, that was the first house we stopped by and he was in complete support of it.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And how many cars do you have right now?

MR. SHAW: We have two.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, no other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat. Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to comment on 1119 South Salem?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, none being heard, we'll close it down for deliberation.

Want to start, Jeff?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I'll start. You know, in general, I'm not a huge fan of granting these types of variances. I do understand the safety concern here. I did drive the neighborhood today actually, and there is certainly a number of similar instances where this is out there. So, I don't see that being as big of an issue as I might normally.

I do recognize Staff's complaint and I'm sensitive to that, but I think in this instance I think I can support this.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I support it as well. I think they met all the criteria, checked all the boxes. I don't know that I've ever seen as much neighbor support on this petition as ever before.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That was a huge pulling factor for me as well I must admit.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: No concerns.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to approve this variance as submitted.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. SHAW: Thank you. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 2414 EAST KENSINGTON ROAD - ZBA #25-047

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:13 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, moving on Item B, 2414 East Kensington Road, ZBA #25-047.

And, Mr. Shaw, you're welcoming to stay, but you're free to leave.

MR. SHAW: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Hi.

MRS. GORRIE: Hi.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Both state your name and address for the record.

MR. GORRIE: Anthony Gorrie, 2414 East Kensington Road.

MRS. GORRIE: Hollis Gorrie, 2414 East Kensington Road.

(Witnesses sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: The property is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a new driveway in order to park one additional vehicle. The proposed driveway is 28.5 feet in width where driveways may be no longer than 22 feet in width per code.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 6.5-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-11.1(b) to allow a driveway 28.5 feet in width where driveways may not exceed 22 feet in width.

Thank you.

MRS. GORRIE: I think I'll get right into the four items. You know, in terms of altering the essential character, we really don't think it will. It still remains a driveway kind of serving its original purpose, and the design is consistent with other residential properties in the area. We don't really think it will disrupt the surrounding neighborhood.

I think that the biggest reason for us is that we are located on a busy street. Kensington Road is a very busy street and it's located right near Prospect High School, so we do have a lot of traffic back and forth. It really does create a hardship as our son is turning 16 in March, so we will have a third driver and a third car and we would like to be able to park that vehicle safely so we don't have to maneuver behind or in front of, you know, a car that's parked in our driveway. We don't have the luxury of parking close by the house on our street. We would have to, you know, figure something else out if that was the scenario.

We do think that the proposed extension aligns with the intent of Chapter 28. It is still safe and functional and it's in a residential use. We don't think that it really conflicts with the zoning principles and supports of our home ownership.

For number four which is that we're requesting the minimum variance, we really are requesting only the minimum extension to accommodate one additional car. We really feel that this will be a modest change that will meet our basic parking needs without overextending the property or affecting other lots.

So, I don't have any documentation on our neighbors but our two neighbors to either side of us are definitely in support. Noted if we ever do anything again, that that would be a good thing for us to have some documentation. But I really think it's just going to really better meet our family needs. You know, our daughter is 13 so she's got a couple of years but we will have another driver. We understand that, you know, larger driveways can sometimes raise concerns about aesthetics but we really want to assure you that we're committed to maintaining really a beautiful, well-kept exterior that really enhances the curb appeal and home with our neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, if you don't mind, I'll ask you some of

APPROVED

the similar questions I just asked like how many people in the family?

MRS. GORRIE: Four.

MR. GORRIE: Four.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Four. So, 13, 16 and --

MRS. GORRIE: 16 in March, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: In March, got you. Okay, I understand that.

The concern I had, so again I drove this one, took a look at it, I think the concern I have is you seem to be pretty tight to your neighbor to the north. In fact, looking at your drawing, it almost looks like, you know, it's showing an eight-foot distance to your property line and you're asking, if I'm reading this correctly, for an 8.5-foot addition to your driveway?

Wouldn't that get you in the neighbor's property?

MRS. GORRIE: 6.5, right?

MR. GORRIE: Yes, 6.5, exactly.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'm sorry, the one I have here, it's showing 8.5. So, that's kind of maybe what's throwing off there.

MR. OSOBA: I believe it's 8.5, the dimension at least that's shown here.

The driveway is set in a little bit, so it's right, going to be right on the property line.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's going to be on the property line though.

You have spoken to the neighbor to, that would be what, the west?

MRS. GORRIE: Justin, yes.

MR. GORRIE: To the west, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And they're on board with basically having the driveway at their property line?

MRS. GORRIE: Yes. I mean, if it would help to have them send you guys something, I would have, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It would have been great, but I understand.

MRS. GORRIE: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I understand. Okay, so I understand how the property's setback is. I know Staff's comment is you have enough room on site. It's pretty similar and it is a busy street. So, at this point in time, I don't have any other questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Jeff, are you talking about the comments from Planning and Community Development?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Correct, I was.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Did you happen to read that comment from Planning and Community Development that says the existing driveway is long enough to accommodate four cars in addition to the two-car attached garage? So, I'm just curious, (a) did you read that, and (b) do you agree with that assessment?

MRS. GORRIE: I think it depends on the size of the car, right?

MR. GORRIE: Yes, we read that comment. I think my take on that is I suppose you could park four cars but I think it's about being able to use the driveway and access the garage in a meaningful and convenient and usable way. So, the proposed extension to the width of the driveway allows for cars to move in and out without having to shuffle cars in and out of a busy road.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

Tom or Frank?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Nothing for me.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Jeff, anything else?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, you can have a seat.

Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on 2414 East Kensington Road?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, we'll close it down for deliberation.

You want to start again, Jeff?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, sure.

Again, I'm not a huge fan of these. I do have some concerns about the proximity to the neighbor's property line and very happy that you guys spoke to them and that they're on board with that. Considering there is no opposition, I would be able to support this one.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I think my hinge factor in this one is that it's in Kensington.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I would agree, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: If it were somewhere else and we talk about every petition is unique, I don't know where I'd be, but since it's on Kensington, I'm generally okay with this.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It is a quite busy street. So, I drove by today, I had to go up and around the block two or three times to get a feel for how it looked, and I do understand the concern there.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: You've got the high school just a block away.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: You have a driver coming or another one coming in a few years, so I think it's a reasonable request.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Agreed, it's a very busy road, and for all the reasons you all mentioned, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to approve the variance as submitted.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Second.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. GORRIE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 1211 SOUTH NEW WILKE ROAD - ZBA #25-048

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:20 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Agenda Item C, 1211 South New Wilke Road, ZBA #25-048.

Hi.

MR. KRAMER: Good evening. John Kramer, Arlington Heights Park District. Work address, 410 North Arlington Heights Road.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, will the property owners also be meaning to speak on this one? Are they present?

MR. KRAMER: The Park District owns the golf course.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Oh, okay, right; this is it. Got it.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. OSOBA: All right. The property Arlington Lakes Golf Club is zoned P-L Public Land District, and the Petitioner, the Arlington Heights Park District, is proposing to remove an existing three-foot tall fence that is open style along South New Wilke Road and replace it with a four-foot tall, open style fence. The proposed fence is a black powder-coated aluminum fence and will be located along Wilke from the Arlington Lakes Golf course entrance to the intersection of New Wilke Road and Central Road. This portion of the property is considered the front yard by the definitions of the Zoning Code, and fences have a maximum height of three feet in all required front yards.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variance:

- A one-foot variance to allow a four-foot, open style fence to be located in the required front yard where the maximum fence height is three feet in the required front yard.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Go ahead.

MR. KRAMER: Absolutely. So, as far as the essential character, the existing fence is in disrepair. It's welded wire fabric with a wood post, probably was closer to four feet when it was originally installed. It has since sagged, along Wilke Road specifically. The new multi-use path that's gone in, largely most of that shrubbery was removed as part of that. So, the fence wasn't even visible largely.

So, that brought us to we need to put a fence in that area that actually stops people now who are walking adjacent to from getting golf balls and people on the golf course from walking out into the right-of-way. So, ultimately, that kind of us was the onus behind it. The existing fence, we were cited because it was in disrepair, so we looked at a replacement strategy.

The existing fence we'd like to carry around the entire course over about the next four-year capital cycles and keep it uniform all the way across the board.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Any feedback from the neighbors all the way around? You've got condos over there. You have residential, office space.

MR. KRAMER: Largely, you know, golf course staff obviously get more requests from the residents that your fence is in disrepair, please fix it. No negative comments of either we don't want a fence, I think most of them prefer a fence. We largely work with most of the residents because of errant golf shots. So, we've planted trees and other things to do that. I do not believe there is any negative connotation from the fence from at least the residents on the Golden Oaks side, that would largely be the residential site. Central doesn't, New Wilke largely does not.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, also there was a comment from the Staff about the footings and how deep they needed to be in the ground.

MR. KRAMER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Did you see that comment?

MR. KRAMER: We did, yes.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Any issue with that?

MR. KRAMER: No, we'll that into consideration when we're installing. I think the existing, we pulled out some wood posts, they were in there largely close to that 36 to 42 inches, but the new fence will exceed that or match that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I don't know if you mentioned it, I apologize. How old is the existing fence?

MR. KRAMER: The wood posts, you know, we went through Google Earth imagery and tried to know when it was put in. You know, it's probably over 25 years. In here I think we stayed 10 just because we don't know the exact.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. KRAMER: But, again, that detail was put in before some bush shrubbery was there, so well past 10 years.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, the Park District got its money's worth.

MR. KRAMER: We one hundred percent have gotten our money out of that welded wire fabric and wood posts, and my golf course staff will be very happy that they don't have to keep replacing the wood posts should you all approve.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Got it.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Has there been an issue with people sneaking out of the course? I know that was in the petition. Big issue?

MR. KRAMER: No, only sporadic. You know, again, it's an attractive nuisance for some in the evenings to go out, but largely, you know, the course is well loved, so I'll say that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Narrow, too.

MR. KRAMER: Fair --

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. KRAMER: Okay, sorry, I'm sorry. Please do not blame the --

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Not a complaint, just an observation.

MR. KRAMER: Just an observation.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You had mentioned that you're planning on replacing all of it over the next four years.

MR. KRAMER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is that something, would they need to come back for each phase of this, or this is one and done?

MR. OSOBA: This is because of the front yard.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Got it.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it, okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And I have no questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Questions?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: No.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat. Thank you.

APPROVED

MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on 1211 South New Wilke Road?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, close it down for deliberation.

Tom, do you want to start?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Again, I think they've met all the criteria we want. From what I saw from the photo, it's a much better-looking fence than the one that's there now. I live a few blocks away from the course, so I see that fence almost everyday when I drive by. So, I'm favor of it.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I would say, I mean, the existing fence is nonconforming. They're replacing a nonconforming fence with a nonconforming fence that looks a whole lot better. I'm in favor.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Agreed. A reasonable ask and one that seems overdue.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Move to approve this petition as presented.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 421 SOUTH BRISTOL LANE - ZBA #25-049

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:26 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, moving on to Agenda Item D, 421 South Bristol Lane, ZBA #25-049.

How are you?

MR. HOLM: Good evening, good. Thank you for your taking time today.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And your name is?

MR. HOLM: I am Nick Holm.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Address?

MR. HOLM: Here for 421 South Bristol.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's your business address?

MR. HOLM: Advance Design Studio, we're at 30 Railroad Street, Gilberts, Illinois.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, got it. Could you raise your right hand, sir?
(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District, and the Petitioner is proposing to construct a one-story addition in the rear of the house, continuing the setback with the existing building. The proposed addition is set back 4.74 feet from the side lot line where six feet is required per code.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 1.26-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(b) to allow an addition with a 4.74-foot side yard setback where a six-foot side yard setback is required.

Thank you.

MR. HOLM: Thank you. As he said, we are looking for a variance to encroach. Now, as you can see from the drawing already, we are already encroaching. We wish to follow the existing setback; we're not looking to change anything else. This is slightly built on an angle; the lot is a little narrower. It's an older home with a growing family and a need for space.

We're looking to do the minimal encroachment. We don't want to change or alter the back scape of the house for the appearance. The neighbors were in agreement. We actually have a letter, I have a copy of it I'm going to present to you, from the neighbor directly to the north which is where this is encroaching the most.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Was it previously in the packet?

MR. HOLM: I do not know if you previously had it in the packet.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, if you don't mind surrendering a copy, we can make sure we include it.

MR. HOLM: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.

MR. HOLM: All right, you want to do that right now?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, please, and we can read it while you discuss.

MR. HOLM: Okay, thank you. They have a beautiful, well-kept yard and want to keep that up. They have a growing family. They have two children, 10 and 12 right now. The house is kind of, they're outgrowing the needs of the house themselves. The space they use to entertain to host events, family events, and this will be an enlargement of their living room and kitchen area so that they can throw their, host there and take care of everything they've got going.

APPROVED

It is an older home as I mentioned, built in the mid 50's. So, it's much smaller than today's needs. They're looking to just kind of grow that and make this more fitting to the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Just a general question. Do you know how long the homeowners have lived in this particular residence?

MR. HOLM: Since 2020. I have the homeowner Sean with me tonight.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, great, thank you. You said a husband and wife and two children, that's right?

MR. HOLM: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, and you can confirm that this is an existing nonconforming use, you're just following the same setback?

MR. HOLM: Correct.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And the neighbor directly affected has, through the letter you've given us, consented to this? No problems whatsoever?

MR. HOLM: Yes. No probably whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, any other neighbor support or opposition?

MR. HOLM: Nobody opposes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, that's all the questions I have. Oh, I want to see the --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, can we just quickly review it before we go to the questions?

MR. BOJIN: Yes, I can read it into the record. It reads: Our neighbors, at least to the south of our residence, are attempting to build an addition on to their home that encroaches to the easement approximately 1.26 feet. We understand this and are okay with this. Signed, Eric and Amy Sagendorph.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do you know approximately how old the house is?

MR. HOLM: It's probably mid-'50's. It's close enough.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Did you look at what the design might look like if you modified it to --

MR. HOLM: We did. We actually asked our architect to kind of draw that in, what it was like without that 1.26 feet. The jog both inside and outside was kind of off-putting as well as like windows that would kind of be affected in that area.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: There is one comment from the Building and Life Safety Department about the exterior wall of the addition is required to have a one-hour fire resistance rating. You're aware of that?

MR. HOLM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, that's all I have, guys.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Anything else from you, Jeff?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, I'm good at this point.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You can have a seat, thank you.

MR. HOLM: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on 421 South Bristol Lane?

(No response.)

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, none being heard, we'll close it down for deliberation.

Frank?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, I think this is a reasonable ask, an existing non-conforming use, they're following the same setback. Minimum variance necessary and neighbor approval and no neighborhood opposition. So, I'm in favor of this variance.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I'm glad that they did look to see what the design would, how it would be affected if they actually met the zoning. I'm content with the answer so I can approve this as well.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Motion to approve as presented.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'll second that.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. HOLM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 611 EAST FAIRVIEW STREET - ZBA #25-050

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:32 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Next, Agenda Item E, 611 East Fairview Street, ZBA #25-050.

Good evening.

MR. FLUBACKER: Good evening, how're you doing?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Good, how are you?

MR. FLUBACKER: Good.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And, Bob, before you get started, I do want to point out I am familiar with this resident. So, it's not going to affect my ability to vote but I do need to let everybody know that I am familiar with them.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Would you state your name and address for the record, please?

MR. FLUBACKER: Bob Flubacker, we're at 1895 Rohlwing Road, Rolling Meadows.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. OSOBA: The property at 611 East Fairview Street is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing a one-story addition along the southern elevation of the property. The 155 square-foot addition is located in the interior side yard of the corner property and will encroach one foot into the required five-foot side yard setback. The existing home is already greater than the maximum floor area ratio and the building lot coverage allowance established by the R-3 District. The existing floor area is 3,930 square feet where the maximum allowance is 2,962 square feet, and the existing building lot coverage is 2,388 square feet where the maximum allowance is 2,304 square feet. This proposed addition will increase the existing nonconforming conditions.

The property did receive Zoning Board approval of variances for building lot coverage and floor area ratio in 2002 for a similar sized building addition and again in 2020. In both cases, the ZBA granted approval of those variances; however, the addition was never constructed and, thus, those approved variances expired pursuant to Chapter 6, Section 6.202(e)(5).

So, therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variances:

- A one-foot variance from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(a) to construct a room addition set back four feet from the side lot line where a minimum side setback of five feet is required;
- A 1,123 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.4 to allow a floor area ratio of 4,085 square feet where 2,962 square feet is the maximum; and
- A 239 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.5(a) to allow a building lot coverage of 2,543 square feet where 2,304 square feet is the maximum.

MR. FLUBACKER: The reason I'm passing these out is I believe the packet you had does not have floor plans in it, and the floor plans, they're operable to the variation. If you look at the third page, that is the existing first floor plan. You can see that it's a unique floor plan with the garage in the middle of the house, and connecting the east and west portions of the house gets very tricky through that room.

My client has investigated multiple other projects to find kind of the home of their dreams with a first-floor master suite. So, this particular design, if you look at

APPROVED

the next page, converts the living room on the far east section of the house into a master suite. We're expanding that section behind the garage for the kitchen and providing a wider access for going from the east to the west portions of the house.

They entertain a lot. She has a wine, kind of a wine critique website and business that she runs, and so they entertain a lot. They also have a lot of family that come over and stay over. So, that's the reason for the encroachment in the back.

It's a little deceptive with all the numbers. Our addition is 155 square feet, so we're adding 155 square feet to the FAR and 155 square feet to the lot coverage.

I have a letter here from the neighbor directly to the south. I had this late so it wasn't able to get into the packet, but they're in favor of the project.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, it's received.

MR. FLUBACKER: Addressing the areas requested, this essentially does not change the character of the house at all. It's in the back side of the house and really not visible from the public areas. The use of the house is not changing and we really tried to keep it as small as possible. This has been a consistent idea arrived at by multiple architects over time that expanding this section of the house is the best way to connect the two segments of the house, so we might be different than the other architect.

So, with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, yes, let's start there. So, in the background information that Staff shared, it said that this property got and received a variation in 2002 for a similar sized building addition and again in 2020. So, if I heard you correctly, the property owners have worked with multiple architects over the course of 24 years, but now want to go with the plan that you've proposed?

MR. FLUBACKER: Which is very similar to what happened in the past.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so they, is it fair to assume that the current property owners have been in that residence since 2002 before?

MR. FLUBACKER: Yes, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, do you know why in previous situations where they've gotten the variation, do you know why they chose not to proceed with the project?

MR. FLUBACKER: So, the 2002 variation I believe actually happened. I think that was a building addition that they built at that time that created the large encroachment on the FAR. In 2020, it was pandemic, you know, all the related kind of miseries of life that time. Again, they had looked at other properties in the immediate area, potentially remodeling it. We did a lot of studies on the project to see if that made more sense than this project.

They've got a lot of, kind of emotional equity in this house. They've lived in there a long time. They've done a lot of improvements that they really like and are hard to replace somewhere else. So, they want to stay where they're at.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, how many people live in the house?

MR. FLUBACKER: Two.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, do you guys have questions?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: No.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Frank?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: No.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, you can have a seat, Bob. Thank you.
Is anybody present who wishes to comment on 611 East Fairview
Street?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, none being heard, I mean, I can start. I mean, the biggest questions I had in reviewing the packet and then listening to Bob's presentation was what I would call the timeline of events with this property in what had been requested, what had been approved, what happened, what didn't. I'm good with the explanation that was delivered as to why things happened and when they happened and when they didn't.

The detailed site plan helped give context to what I would say is the data and numbers in the packet. The fact that there is one letter of neighbor support and no known neighbor opposition, I would be comfortable proceeding with this petition.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'd agree, especially the neighbor to the south who is directly affected is the one who's supporting which I think is key to me right now.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Move to approve the variances as
requested.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. FLUBACKER: Thank you, guys.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.)

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

OF APPEALS

RE: 907 WEST BRAESIDE DRIVE - ZBA #25-052

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:41 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
JEFF LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planning Staff Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planning Staff
HANNAH SAED, Legal Staff

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, that brings us to Agenda Item F, 907 West Braeside Drive, ZBA #25-052.

Good evening.

MR. BRENNAN: Good evening. I'm Sean Brennan; I'm the homeowner. This is my wife, Crista Gerzevske.

MS. GERZEVSKE: Crista Gerzevske.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, I see most of you are coming up. So, are all of you going to talk? Because I'm going to get you all sworn in then.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, so let's do it one at a time. Are you going to talk?

MS. MEDINA: No, I can talk last.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Then I still need you sworn in. So, we'll start with the property owners and then --

MR. BRENNAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, go ahead.

MR. BRENNAN: My name is Sean Brennan, and I'll speaking on behalf of our property.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's your address?

MR. BRENNAN: 907 West Braeside Drive.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And who are you?

MS. GERZEVSKE: Crista Gerzevske, 907 West Braeside Drive.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Keep close to the microphone please.

MR. ROHN: Trevor Rohn with Icon Building Group, 486 Woodland Chase in Vernon Hills.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MS. MEDINA: Rose Medina, I work for Icon Building Group.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's your address?

MS. MEDINA: The address is 106 Roman Lane in Hawthorn Woods, Illinois.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, can all four of you huddle near the microphone?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. OSOBA: The property at 907 West Braeside Drive is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing an 829 square-foot family room addition in the rear or east side yard, or rear yard, excuse me, of the property, along with an extension of the existing porch in the exterior side yard which is on the north. The property is a corner lot, therefore, the yard adjacent to North Kennicott Avenue is considered the front yard as it is the shorter of the two corner lot frontages. The architectural design of the proposed addition and front porch extension have been reviewed and approved administratively by Village Staff pending the approval of the variances here tonight. The addition encroaches 16.7 feet into the required 30-foot rear yard setback, and the front porch extension of an added portico encroaches 2.02 feet into the required 26.44-foot exterior side yard setback.

APPROVED

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variations:

- A 2.02-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(c) to allow a building addition to be set back 24.42 feet where a setback of 26.44 feet is required; and
- A 16.7-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(d) to allow a building addition to be set back 13.3 feet where a setback of 30 feet is required.

MR. BRENNAN: Okay, so like I said earlier, I'm Sean. I live at 907 West Braeside with my wife Crista. As described, we're seeking a variation for an addition on the east side of our house. We need this addition because the Village Code states, or sorry, we need the variance because the Village Code states the front yard of our house faces Kennicott where the front door of our house and also our address faces West Braeside Drive.

We really enjoy living on West Braeside Drive and we'd like to expand our living space as both my wife and I work from home. The new space would not only serve as a living room but also as workspace for myself and potentially my wife as well. Currently, we're working in a small cramped office together.

In addition, the addition would also include moving our laundry room which currently is adjacent to our kitchen and it's very cramped. It also houses our furnace and water heater which we're concerned is a little dangerous. We are planning to replace the furnace and bring it to meet Village Code for that as well.

To answer the four essential criteria, first, the essential character, we have images of three other corner lots in our neighborhood that also appear to have this variance. Two of them appear to even be similar floor plans to our house design as well.

MS. GERZEVSKE: One of these two houses --

MR. BRENNAN: One is, yes, two houses adjacent to us.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Were they submitted in the packet?

MR. BRENNAN: Were they submitted, Trevor? We have the images.

MR. ROHN: I believe they were, but I'll, these are --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And you have a copy to give to Dan?

MR. ROHN: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. BRENNAN: And then as was mentioned, we also worked with Steve Hautzinger at the Village Design Board to ensure that the character of the addition looks like a natural extension of the house and also matches the character of the neighborhood.

For the second one, we believe our case is unique and requires a variation because of the orientation of the lot because we're on a corner lot.

As for the minimum variation, we requested the variation that puts our east side of the property at a 13-foot setback. If the front of our house was to the north, if we were not on a corner lot, then the required setback would be 10 feet. So, we would be within that Village Code if the front of our house was to the north.

Then, also for the variance on the north side of the house for the front portico, that was actually suggested by Steve Hautzinger as a way to make the character of the house appear, make the addition appear to be less of an addition and more of a natural extension of the house. If we need to adjust that, we're more than happy to adjust the front portico. We're more concerned about the side, well, the rear yard, sorry, corner lot sets a confusing verbiage.

MS. GERZEVSKE: East here.

APPROVED

MR. BRENNAN: The east side, yes, we're more concerned with that variation. Then --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: When you say more concerned --

MR. BRENNAN: Oh, sorry, we're more concerned about getting the variation. If we need to make adjustments on the north of the house, that was just suggested by Steve.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. BRENNAN: So, if that was not approved, then we would be okay with that.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. BRENNAN: And then also, our design, we think it respects the intent of the neighborhood as an added to the home in a way that is very similar to other houses in the neighborhood and also maintains the same aesthetics as the sort of like neighborhood characteristic. We're also, in addition, we're not adding any windows on the east side of the house to maintain some privacy.

Then, lastly, we also received the same variance here for our fence. We built a fence out to the west side and needed a variance because the lot was treated the same way.

MS. GERZEVSKE: The orientation.

MR. BRENNAN: The orientation of the lot. So, we have a fence that extends out to the west side and have a variance for that as well.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: When did you purchase the home?

MR. BRENNAN: In 2020. Yes, so we've lived there for five years. Then, to close, we've shown the plan to our neighbors to the rear and across the street. Both approved verbally and sent in written statements. Did they make it in? Yes, okay, so they're in there.

We also discussed it with our adjacent neighbors. Initially, we had a verbal approval, but they're official Objectors tonight.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. BRENNAN: So, we did have verbal approval initially, but that's all I have, I'm happy to answer any questions. We also have our builders here to answer any other questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, how many people live in the house?

MR. BRENNAN: Two.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Two.

Dan, could you pull up the one letter that was in the packet, the one that was in opposition? So, I just want to clarify something. This neighbor in their letter suggested that you, and I'm sorry I can't see it properly, but a tall fence and I think, I'm going to be paraphrasing, where is it? These homeowners have already been allowed to break Village Codes recently by erecting a tall fence around their property.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, you're saying that this fence that you erected was done with a variance?

MR. BRENNAN: That was done with a variance and --

MS. GERZEVSKE: It was not due to size; it was due to being a corner lot. The fence is within what would be required.

APPROVED

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, I'm not sure why they said that we're breaking the codes for that. Yes, but we've got the variance for that.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Dan, can you confirm that?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, and Chair, for you, those two letters that were sent, they were sent over the weekend.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. OSOBA: So, I do have copies for everybody; I can also read it into the record.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Given the sensitivity to this, why don't we go ahead and read them in?

MR. OSOBA: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. OSOBA: So, it says: To whom it may concern. My name is Russ Stejskal. I live at 908 Braeside Drive. I have reviewed the plans that Sean Brennan has for the addition to this house and have no objections. This will beautify his home and add much needed value to the neighborhood. If you have any questions, I can be reached at contact information. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

The second one: To whom it may concern. My wife Sheryl and I have had the pleasure of being neighbors of Sean Brennan and Crista, I'm going to mispronounce your last name, I'm sorry, G., since they moved in next door. We are unable to attend the public hearing on Monday, February 9th. They have always notified us of property improvements they plan to make and asked if we had any questions or concerns about how the improvements would affect us and our property. Their property enhancements, including beautiful landscaping and the visually appealing fence around the property, have been tasteful and completed without any disturbance. Therefore, we will fully support the planned addition to their home and are very confident that Sean and Crista will again choose a contractor who will ensure the work is done with only a positive impact on the aesthetics of our property and their home. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I find it hard to believe that anyone who is as fortunate as we believe we are to have such considerate neighbors as Sean and Crista would have any concerns about the appearance and construction of their planned addition. Respectfully yours,
Dave Letwat.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, those two letters you just read, so we have two letters that are in support.

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And we have one letter that's in opposition and we have a Formal Objector as of right now, okay. I just have one more question and then I'll see what the Board has.

So, as far as minimum use, I mean let's talk about the larger of the two asks in the addition and maybe this, you know, I'll direct to the builders. Can you help the Board understand, you know, how you arrived at what is currently being asked for as the minimum amount that they need?

MR. ROHN: Yes, so Sean and Crista alluded to this. I guess stepping back a little bit, we went through a number of iterations of this project, building up, building down, all of which were going to have a much more significant impact to the house itself and to the homeowners. Newly installed roof, newly installed solar panels, having to

APPROVED

impact the kitchen that was brand new before they bought the home in 2020, so we opted to go out to the east. The initial operating assumption obviously was incorrect that we were well within the 10-foot setback, so that was, you know, so we went out in that direction and created a space that we thought was comfortable and appropriate for a family room and a laundry room.

Like we said, we are short of, if we had to consider a 10-foot setback, we aren't short of that, so I think we've been mindful of the rules and not looking to not only exceed, you know, ask for the 16-foot variance request like we're not maxing it out, you know, either. Shrinking this addition, I think we would just lose some of the function of it being a family room. The laundry room would get tight and it wouldn't accomplish some of our objectives here.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, did I hear you correctly, the property owners have already invested in a new roof and new windows?

MR. ROHN: As when they were purchasing the home, a new roof was done, yes.

MR. BRENNAN: Not windows. We invested in a new roof and solar panels.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Solar panels, yes.

MR. BRENNAN: So, that's part of why we decided against building up because that would require tearing out the roof and relocating the solar panels.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Or you'd have to --

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, exactly.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. ROHN: Also, we met two years ago because that's when this whole process began. So, this has been a long and winding road to get to this place and again go through all these different iterations of this project and just felt this is going to be right one. It was just the most appropriate given the condition of their home and the layout.

The orientation of the lot is unfortunate. I get why it's done that way. We're not arguing to change, you know, the code by any means, just looking to use a little common sense as we look at, you know, what is the front of the house and what's the side of the house or the rear.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, Board members, other questions for now?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Not at this point.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat.

So, Village Counsel, sequence of events, we're going to call the Formal Objectors to the podium. Do they have to identify themselves, address, and get sworn in?

MS. SAED: Yes. So, the Objectors will go first, and then they'll be able to cross examine the Applicant or the Applicant's witnesses. Then, I'll also point out that registered objectors are not restricted to a time limit for public comment unlike regular public commenters that are limited to three minutes. But we just ask that you keep any comments germane to the issue at hand and the criteria for the variances.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, if I'm pronouncing it correctly, is it Gupnik, Gaspnik?

MR. GASPARIK: Gasparik.

MRS. GASPARIK: Gasparik.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, you can come on up. Thank you. Sorry.

APPROVED

Okay, so could you both state your name and addresses for the record?

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes, Deborah Gasparik, 903 West Braeside.

MR. GASPARIK: David Gasparik, 903 West Braeside.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Go ahead.

MRS. GASPARIK: Good evening, members of the Board. My name is Deborah. My husband Dave and I live at 903 West Braeside, directly adjacent to the property requesting a setback variance.

We want to begin by saying that we value having Sean and Crista as neighbors. We appreciate their desire to improve their home, and we understand how important it is for families to create spaces that meet their needs. At the same time, we would like to share how the proposed setback variance would affect our property and why we have concerns about approving a variance without complete information.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes, I just want to say one thing. When the initial proposal was coming out, I think in October, or August timeframe, they asked us saying we're looking to expand our property. That's all he said, you know, looking into it, but no plans were ever shared with us either, so the only way we saw the plans was they posted it on the website. Nothing was ever reviewed with us.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You said it was October?

MRS. GASPARIK: September.

MR. GASPARIK: September.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MRS. GASPARIK: One of the primary reasons we purchased our home 17 years ago was the open, spacious character of the surrounding lots. Sunlight, green space, and a sense of openness are defining features of our neighborhood. Along the east side rear property, we maintain a vegetable garden for many years because it receives actually the most sunlight. After a tall privacy fence was installed on the neighboring property, that garden began to struggle due to reduced light. The proposed addition located just over 13 feet from our lot line would further reduce sunlight and would likely make that space no longer viable for gardening or perhaps even shrubs if we want to plant those.

Beyond sunlight, we also have concerns about drainage and stormwater management. The site plan shows a substantial amount of hardscape including patios, walkways, paths, stoops and a shed, and the materials described as stone appear to be impermeable concrete pavers which do not absorb runoff. The property already contains a deep crawl space with a sump pump and the proposed addition will require an additional sump pump. Given the amount of hardscaping, it's critical to understand where stormwater will be redirected and how runoff will be managed to ensure it does not negatively impact adjacent properties such as ours. Currently, our property has a slab for a garage and then behind our garage is a slab family room. So, we're kind of worried if we have increased water, that we could get damage in those two structures.

Several key documents also appear to be missing from the submission including a full drainage plan, a complete landscape plan, an electrical and exterior lighting plan, and interior floor plans showing both existing layout and proposed

APPROVED

use of the addition. Without these materials, it's difficult for us we believe for the Board to fully understand the scale, impact and intent of the project. We respectfully believe it is reasonable to prepare complete plans before granting a variance.

We also have concerns regarding exterior lighting. The neighboring property currently uses permanent roofline lighting throughout the year. Although seasonal lighting is enjoyable, the ongoing flashing and racing lights impact the character of the nearby homes. We're concerned that with the larger portico, there would be more lighting. Without an exterior lighting plan, it's impossible to evaluate whether the proposed addition would increase this impact.

Finally, we would like to address the neighborhood character. The proposed color palette and exterior materials appear darker and more contrasting than our surrounding homes. While personal taste is subjective, zoning standards often consider compatibility with the existing neighborhood, and we believe this is an appropriate consideration for the Board.

We want to emphasize that we are not opposed to our neighbors improving their home. Our concern is that any changes be made responsibly with full transparency and with careful consideration for their impact on adjacent properties and on the consistency of established zoning standards. Setback requirements exist to provide uniformity, predictability and fairness for all homeowners. The residents rely on those standards when purchasing and maintaining their homes, just like we relied on the standard when we purchased our home that we would have a certain distance between us and the next neighbor.

We have lived in our home for 17 years. We raised our children here, and we remain deeply involved in this community. This is not simply a property to us, it is our home. We respectfully ask the Board to require complete plans and clear documentation before approving any variance, and to carefully consider the impacts on sunlight, drainage, lighting, and neighborhood character as part of your decision.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Just a quick question based on her summary. Is the packet complete?

MR. OSOBA: It is. The ZBA petition was deemed complete by Staff. Those drainage plans, landscape plans, photometrics and floor plans often are submitted with building permit and not often required as part of ZBA submittals.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, were you going to say something before that, Dan, when I turned to you?

MRS. GASPARIK: And I just want to say, also, Sean did talk to us about the plans in September. We met on the front yard, and he did say that he would show us the plans, and unfortunately, he never did show us the plans.

MR. GASPARIK: Like I said, it was on the website.

MRS. GASPARIK: We did get, we got it all a few days before --

MR. GASPARIK: I contacted Daniel and he's the one that notified me it's going to be posted on the website.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: That's how we found out about the plans. I kind of feel like it's unfair, like it's kind of snuck in.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes. Our verbal agreement was just to see what their

APPROVED

plan was, and we didn't see that.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes. Like I said, it was about like five days before notification and all that stuff. So, we didn't have any time to talk to the neighbors or research or anything like that, you know. I know they got delayed a month and we were able to do more research on it, but again, it happened in January. Like I say, the initial variance hearing was on then.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, to clarify and confirm, you referenced plans that may or may not have been complete, or that you didn't see them. So, I'm just trying to --

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Hold on, you'll have a chance to come back up. The packet is complete. There was no communication between you and the neighbor. The only opportunity you had to review these plans in their complete form was when they were posted online?

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, I just, I want to, I know it might sound like splitting hairs, but if the Petitioner did submit the plans but they did not communicate or share them with you, that's different than we're looking at something that could be incomplete or inaccurate. Do you see where I'm coming from?

MR. GASPARIK: Got you.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes. Right, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right. Okay, that's why we do this. Guys? Okay, order of operations, how does this work now? I'm sorry, were you finished with your statement?

MR. GASPARIK: Yes.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: Well, I do have one question.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, go ahead.

MR. GASPARIK: Okay, if there is any water damage or anything like that from construction or later on if this gets approved, how do we get not liable for any damages or anything that occurs?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, keep in mind, drainage, water issues, I hate to say this, it's not really within the purview or jurisdiction of this Board. If this were approved, as they go through that official permitting process, that is when Engineering and other related departments would make sure things are graded properly and the like.

MR. OSOBA: That is correct. In part, the permit review further detailed plans, grading plans, analysis on how this would impact the properties. Runoff, stormwater, all get evaluated with that permit submittal.

MR. GASPARIK: Got you.

MR. OSOBA: In greater depth than what we've seen before.

MR. GASPARIK: Okay. All right, just with how the equipment moving in and out, you know, any damage or anything like that that could happen to our house, again, I won't be liable if there's any damage, you know.

MR. OSOBA: I can speak to that. Contractor, any contractor that's licensed with the Village of Arlington Heights has to have insurance. All of that goes through our

APPROVED

Building Department. Anyone that's doing work in the Village has to be a licensed contractor with the Village so that is based on the requirement. If something did happen, then it would be through that insurance.

MR. GASPARIK: Got you, okay.

MR. OSOBA: But separate from the building itself.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And then just to address a little bit on how our process works up here, we get plans relatively early in the process because if we don't approve it, it doesn't go to, you know, they then take the next step. They then go further into the design and what have you and permits and everybody gets a chance to, Engineering gets a chance to look at it. Again, if we don't approve it, then they don't spend their money. They go home and nobody worries about it anymore.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes, makes sense. Makes sense, yes.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: At this stage, two of the departments had no comments. The third department, Planning, just simply commented on the design.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, I actually have another two questions, I think one more for you Dan, and then for the neighbors. So, when you were giving your summary, I believe I heard you mention in the plans you saw or had some concerns around materials that may not have been pervious.

Is that correct or did you say something about that?

MRS. GASPARIK: Oh, about the stones?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Correct.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes. Right, I think that, and we're both north-south facing properties, right? So, grass doesn't grow so great on either of our properties. So, I know in their backyard they have a lot of stone because they have a beautiful large maple tree and there's no grass. So, with this addition, it will just be more paved surfaces. So, I'm just kind of concerned about water and runoff into our property. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, that's why I want to clarify. So, do you have the numbers in front of you, Dan? If we were to approve this as it were presented, what would that do to their impervious surface area coverage?

MR. OSOBA: I unfortunately don't have the numbers off the top of my head, and I apologize, I should have brought those with me. As part of our review, the maximum allowance for impervious surface coverage, and that would be any manmade surface plus the house, would be 50 percent of the lot and they were under that amount. I wouldn't know the exact number.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right. Okay, I just, yes, I was trying to figure out how close would we be getting to that number.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Are you having any drainage issues from their property to yours?

MRS. GASPARIK: No, not right now. Yes, just the blocking sunlight, that's all.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes, like I say, it's kind of a blow.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: When we purchased the property, you know, it was kind of open area.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: Now we're getting fences and everything else, you know.

APPROVED

MRS. GASPARIK: Unlike before we didn't have any fences.

MR. GASPARIK: That's the reason why we bought the property was this, the openness around our trees and all that stuff. Now we're losing a lot of privacy.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: We're living in a fishbowl.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes. I mean, we're sympathetic because I understand being on a corner lot. My sister has a lot similar to Sean and Crista's, and again you've got that side space and it's, but unfortunately, that's just what you bought, you know. You have to kind of take into consideration I think when you purchase something that that's the existing boundaries that you have to build on and, you know, putting fences, six-foot fences up into the front yards, I think if everybody had that, I don't know if anyone would necessarily desire to live in our neighborhood anymore.

MR. GASPARIK: Actually, we should have opposed that variation.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: Now that we saw it, it's like ugh, you know, it doesn't look good.

MRS. GASPARIK: And Sean and Crista, they're really lovely people. They're actually really nice. Just I can reiterate what that, I can agree with what that neighbor said, they do always ask us, every time they're trying to make, you know, plans and changes on to their house, they do run it by us. You know, I appreciate that, you know, but --

MR. GASPARIK: Yes, it's changing.

MRS. GASPARIK: It's just changing.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, let me ask you a hypothetical. You know, so their variance request is to reduce from 26 feet, am I understanding that right? 13?

MR. OSOBA: 30 feet.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: 30 feet to 13?

MR. OSOBA: 30 feet to 13 feet.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is your stance basically it needs to stay at 30 or, you know, 13 is just too close? Is there a middle ground in there? And I don't, it's just a hypothetical.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I don't have a solution here that is like, okay, we'll wave the magic wand.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: No, I think like the fence, I think it's too high.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: And then I think with something that encroached around our property --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Again, the front yard of the fence is unfortunately over on, you know, the other street, so that was the variance was that. The fence, where it is on your property, was permissible and there was no variance required. We had no say on that one really. It was just on the one street which is on the opposite

APPROVED

side of their lot.

So, it is a little bit of, again, being on a corner lot, even for you folks, it's a little hard to figure out what's the front yard, what's the backyard, what's the side yard. I live in a corner lot and I have similar issues, your sister does. You have to work through some of that.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes, and I get it. Like I said, if it's the other situation and someone is living next to you doing this, would you approve it, you know, or would you be against it?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Again, if it's a rear yard, we don't really have any say. They don't have to come to us for a variance on that.

MRS. GASPARIK: Right, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It was only the opposite side that they come to us.

MRS. GASPARIK: Right. Well, and the neighbors that support them are the ones that are in their rear yard. We're not meant people. I mean, they know that. We help them feed their cat and you know.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Sure, sure.

MRS. GASPARIK: I mean we're, yes, we're very friendly. So, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I got you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I was going to go in a similar direction that Jeff was going to go. I recognize that there have been some communication challenges. Then, on the fence side, sir, I'm not taking that into account because it wasn't properly challenged. If it's a situation where they put something up and then they go to permit, that's different.

MR. GASPARIK: I get it.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: They followed the code just like you would, just like I would. So, going where Jeff was going, are you opposed to these variances altogether or is there some --

MR. GASPARIK: The lights concern me a little bit.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: But the lights aren't, again, sir, they're asking for two variances. They're asking for the addition and the portico. The fence, the lights, that's stuff that you guys got to figure out as neighbors. But what was brought here tonight, what we've been asked to help figure out is should we grant these petitions for the portico and for the addition. You've registered yourself as a Formal Objector. So, what I'm trying to understand and I think what the other Board members are trying to understand is are you opposed to either, both as they're presented? Is there a middle ground?

Help us understand what you want and what you're asking for. In the same way, we're trying to understand what they're asking for and what they want. Now is your chance because as the attorney stated, you have a lot of time here and you've taken a lot of time, so before we set you guys back down, try and figure out what is your ask.

MRS. GASPARIK: We're objecting.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Object to what?

MRS. GASPARIK: To the setback, the portico and the distance.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, that's fair. Okay, thank you.

MRS. GASPARIK: Thank you.

APPROVED

MS. SAED: And you guys have an opportunity to cross examine the owner and the builder as well if you have any questions for them. They'll have an opportunity to answer them directly.

MR. GASPARIK: Like I said, the question was regarding the drainage and things like that, you know, but it's something that's in the permitting process.

MS. SAED: Either of you are welcome to enter the podium to answer those questions.

MR. BRENNAN: Trevor, we discussed drainage. That is something I believe --

MR. ROHN: Yes. So, first off, I want you to know I just appreciate you guys helping here.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Please come closer to the mic.

MR. ROHN: Oh, sorry. I, you know, admittedly it was frustrating when last month's meeting got canceled. In hind sight, I'm happy because hopefully you guys feel like you have a voice on this and you can talk through this. I get the concerns. I, you know, as a, you know, I work as a project manager; I am so incredibly sensitive to not just my customers, the way that it impacts the neighborhood and people surrounding them.

If we proceed with this project, you will get to know me very well, you know, I'm not going to be a stranger. We take all these things, we take this all into account, right?

We alluded to, you know, there was no intent to be deceitful, you know. It was, hey, we're going to improve our plans, okay, yes, without seeing the plan, that was not intentional.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, and I do apologize for that. We did have the mockups at the time. I thought I had shown you the mockups, that's what I thought. I apologize. Yes, we had those plans. They did get adjusted, but what we had initially submitted, the addition I think was behind the fence, but the Village Planning Board, or the Design Board asked us to make it look more in character with the house. So, I apologize for not keeping you guys informed on that.

MR. GASPARIK: We kind of felt kind of blindsided, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Sorry, I know it might be awkward because you guys are cross examining. Maybe two of you stand on one side of the podium from the others like a high school debate, but just this way, at least, you know, the microphone captures everything. Sorry, I probably shouldn't have asked you to sit down. Thank you.

MR. ROHN: Yes, again, like as the builder, none of that was intentional or, you know, intending to be deceitful. The concerns about engineering and lighting and all that, you know, the point that was brought up, like what I noticed about the Village of Arlington Heights, it is an incredibly thorough process. There will be a ton of hurdles to clear. There was no sense in getting too far into the weeds on some of that stuff knowing that we might not even be allowed to do this building, right?

All of the proper steps are going to be taken. Any concerns about drainage, lighting, like those are hurdles that still need to be cleared, right. Hopefully we cross that, it's not this Board but, you know, the Board or the Engineering Department that's involved in that, they're incredibly thorough. They are not going to allow us to do anything that is going to negatively impact you guys in the neighborhood or anything like that.

APPROVED

I don't want to speak on their behalf, but that has just been my experience in working with them. Again, you know, we submitted for permit for this back in August I want to say, and it was, oh, you've got to deal with zoning, you've got to deal with design. I mean, there is a ton of boxes to check, right?

You know, where do we go from here? You know, we'll finish this meeting, you know; if we get approved, that's great. I mean, I think this won't be the last time that we interact with you guys. While I won't let you design the project with us, I want to keep you guys in mind. Like you said, the neighbors that approved it to the north and south are impacted the least. It's still valuable because, you know, they're still close neighbors, but you guys matter in all of this, right?

You know, I'm not going to, like, turn down any questions. If I don't know the answer to something, I'm always going to say I don't know, but I'm going to get back to you. Then it's just like that is my style. Being in construction, I'm not expert in everything but I rely on a lot of experts to do this job.

MR. GASPARIK: Okay, appreciate it.

MR. BRENNAN: As for the lighting concerns, yes, we do have permanent lighting up. You know, we use it for holiday lighting and then something like Valentine's Dave lights. I didn't know that that was a concern for you guys.

MRS. GASPARIK: Well, I think I'm concerned that you got the big --

MR. BRENNAN: Sure.

MRS. GASPARIK: The porticos look beautiful by the way. I think they look really, I think the design of the exterior to the house looks really nice for sure. But then now it's going to be taller and I'm afraid you're going to have those racing lights. It just looks a little commercial.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And I drove by the house; I know exactly what they're talking about.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, I mean, again, if we work through this, is that something that you would be a little bit more sensitive to as the structure gets bigger?

MR. BRENNAN: Definitely.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Your lighting, especially these permanent race lighting, maybe these aren't the best things to have for your neighbors to be --

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, we didn't know that was an issue. Again, definitely, if that's something that --

MR. GASPARIK: Like I say, just for holidays and stuff like that, it's really fine.

MRS. GASPARIK: Of course, yes.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes. No, that's something that we can definitely, you know

--

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes, and it's not just you. It's becoming a trend here.

MR. BRENNAN: Right, yes. There are other neighbors in the neighborhood that that's a similar thing.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. BRENNAN: So, you're right. Kind of following that trend, but if that's a concern, then we can nix that from the plans, at least, you know, having them on year-round.

APPROVED

MR. GASPARIK: No, you might have in the plans, but as long as it's, you know, limited, I'm totally for it.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes. Yes, definitely, definitely. Yes, I think, as for other concerns, like I said, for the, you know, if the front portico is a concern, like I said we're happy to pull that back.

MRS. GASPARIK: I think it looks better going forward. I like that the fence is, the fence was an eyesore because it's just --

MR. GASPARIK: It's huge, yes.

MRS. GASPARIK: -- it's almost as tall as our house. So, now at least it's back in the foreground a bit so it looks nice, but it's still really close to the front of our house which is not so nice looking.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes. Like I say, as soon as I saw it come up, it's like what the heck, man.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes. It's a nice fence.

MR. GASPARIK: It's a good fence, it's just too close or probably, you know, too high, that's it.

MRS. GASPARIK: That's all, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Does this constitute your cross examination?

MS. SAED: So, kind of like a mediation.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Now you know what it feels like to sit back here.

MS. SAED: But if you guys are done cross examining them, then if you guys have any like closing remarks that you want to make, Sean and team, and then after you guys make any closing remarks, then we can have public comment if the general public would like to speak.

So, are you guys --

MR. GASPARIK: We're good.

MS. SAED: You're done? Okay, very good.

MR. BRENNAN: Can I have just a second?

Cris, can I ask you a quick question?

(Whereupon Mr. Brennan confers with Ms. Gerzevske.)

MR. BRENNAN: In closing, I guess just to say my closing remarks, we believe that this variance stays, you know, with everything that we discussed, stays within the character of the neighborhood as there are multiple other houses in the neighborhood that have the same variance. The fence came up a couple of times and I think that that's, you know, a separate issue that we'll have to discuss with our neighbors at a different time. We didn't realize that that was such an issue.

Again, I apologize for not showing the full plans as they were worked on. It was kind of fast and furious at the end of the year to work with the Design Board to get those plans adjusted to match the character of the neighborhood.

We do believe that we're still within the character of the neighborhood and the intent of the code which is to provide, you know, certain setbacks for properties based on, you know, the layout of a property. Because we're on a corner lot, it does make things a bit more complicated, but we have been informed that this kind of variance is quite common and usually gets approved with no issues or minimal issues. So, I know that for the town itself, this isn't unheard of and a potentially quite common variance to be approved.

APPROVED

I think that's it for me.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, so we'll see if there's anybody in the --

MS. SAED: Any general public comment.

MR. BRENNAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this agenda item, 907 West Braeside Drive?

MR. STEJSKAL: My name is Russ Stejskal; I live at 908 Braeside right across the street from Sean and Crista. In the five years they've been there, they've done more improvements to this house than I've done in 25 years being there. Anything they put in their house is going to be quality, it's going to be great.

They really do like their community a lot. They take a lot of pride in the community, the neighborhood. Everybody loves them. I think that whatever they put there, or whatever their addition is, it's going to more than exceed everyone's expectations.

That's pretty much all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you for that.

Is there anybody else present who wishes to comment publicly?

MS. MEDINA: I want to say --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We can't hear you. You have to come to the mic.

MS. MEDINA: I worked with Steve Hautzinger during the process of design because the original design didn't meet, you know, the character that he wanted to go for. He actually suggested to add lighting on the addition, but we can, you know, remove it if --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I think based on what's happened over the last 35 minutes, I would strongly encourage you to speak with your neighbors on what would be something that, just because the Design Department thinks it would be a good idea, it may not be a good idea to the people who have been living next door for 17 years.

MS. MEDINA: Yes, I think that we can compromise on that.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MS. SAED: We can wrap up the public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do the Petitioners still get a chance to respond to public comment if they want? They have that right, right?

MS. SAED: Yes. Yes.

MR. BRENNAN: I --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We can't hear you. So, just give me a thumbs up or thumbs down.

MR. BRENNAN: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I want to be clear, is the Objector, are you still objecting based on everything that's just happened? Are you standing pat on that, or have you changed your mind about your objections?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Tom, they have to come back up.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Well, I'm not clear.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I understand, but if they're going to answer they need to be by the mic.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: That's fine, yes.

APPROVED

MR. GASPARIK: I have no problem.

MRS. GASPARIK: Our biggest issue was the fence and the lights, and maybe that's something we can talk to them ourselves.

MR. GASPARIK: Like I say, it's --

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes, it just felt like, they're lovely people and they are doing, like Russ said, they're doing amazing things to that house.

MR. GASPARIK: Yes.

MRS. GASPARIK: Russ knows we've been through a lot with that rental property.

MR. GASPARIK: We've had squatters; we've had drug dealers next door.

MRS. GASPARIK: We had a lot and --

MR. GASPARIK: Yes, the father and son drug dealer that lived there prior to them.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes.

MR. GASPARIK: They're a breath of fresh air compared to what we've had there.

MRS. GASPARIK: A 100 percent.

MR. GASPARIK: It meant a lot to the neighborhood.

MRS. GASPARIK: Yes, a 100 percent. It's just the old, there's a lot of changes and they are directly impacting more our property than anyone else.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, let's close it down for Board deliberation.

I'm going to start. Obviously, we knew coming into this evening this was going to be the most complicated given what was on paper, given some of the anticipated neighborhood feedback and the Objectors. I was encouraged that there were some neighbors in support, but I want to hand it to the, Gasparnik?

MRS. GASPARIK: Gasparik.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Gasparik. The Gaspariks, I really respected and appreciated the way that they've presented their position. There are communication issues with this petition that, not to sound heavy-handed, should be addressed by adults and I would expect that to be improved as this project moves forward. On paper it's probably not ideal, but given the circumstances, I think I'm okay as long as the property owners do a much better job communicating what is and what is not going on with the neighbors who have lived next door for 17 years and, in my opinion, presented very legitimate, logical concerns about the state of this project. Those are my comments.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, my comments, I'll jump in next, I guess. My comments, you know, a 30-foot to a 13-foot variance is a sizeable variance. Again, I live on a corner side yard lot so I understand the complications with that type of structure and that you have setbacks from both sides kind of weighing in. It's very difficult to fit into the box that you're allowed.

I think the Petitioner has done a pretty good job of trying to put something together that would work for them and stay in context with the neighborhood. Completely understand your concerns that it's close by, you know, you had this lovely green space next to you, it wasn't your property, but you had this lovely green space next to you. It gets hard to see that kind of, to move.

I think I'm leaning towards, and the portico to me doesn't really affect

APPROVED

one way or the other. I think that's pretty normal, something that creates a nice entrance to the house. So, that one I'd approve hands down. The addition is a little tougher, but again, considering the care that's been put into it, I would support this one.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I didn't know what to think coming into this petition and I really didn't know what to think while all of this was going on, but where I wound up is I'm going to go for it.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, I agree with Tom. Helping us, you know, understand the timeline and the context of all this, and the proposed solutions and the, you know, promises to further communicate. I think it would help everyone, but the discussion and discourse here that we had was very helpful and I've come out in favor.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'll second that.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

Is there any other business?

MR. OSOBA: Just very brief. I gave everybody a copy of the procedures for the Zoning Board. We are going to be discussing those on the March meeting, if you wanted to make any changes, if the Board as a whole wanted to make any changes to those procedures, we can do that at that meeting or reaffirm exactly what's there. So, I just wanted to give everybody a heads up and provide that, but that's the only business I've got.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: If members are unable to attend, do you want them to just provide feedback to you in advance?

MR. OSOBA: We will, it would have to be at the meeting that that discourse happens, not separate from that meeting is the way that we're trying to do it. So, I'll poll folks as we get closer to that meeting. If we don't have, if we have four, there's not really, we don't have to do it in March if that's the plan but, you know, if we only have four again, we'll move it to April.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And just, you're shooting for March 9th for that meeting at this point in time?

MR. OSOBA: Trying to, yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Sadly, you will be without my lovely company for that meeting. So, if we want to move the discussion, proceed without me.

MR. OSOBA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any general public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion to adjourn?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We're off the record.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:29 p.m.)

APPROVED

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RONALD LeGRAND, JR., depose and say that I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois; that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

RONALD LeGRAND, JR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
_____, A.D. 2026.

NOTARY PUBLIC