

APPROVED

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 1225 NORTH WALNUT AVENUE - ZBA #25-053

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 23rd day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Village Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Village Planner

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, we're going to call this month's meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order. Let's start with a 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.

Okay, next we're going to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

If everybody could please stand and face the back of the

room?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Let the record show that Board Member O'Connor has arrived.

Let's next go to the approval of minutes.

Have all the Board members had an opportunity to review the minutes of the February 9th meeting?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Move to approve the minutes as presented.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, next let's go over the hearing procedures. So, first, if less than six members are present, there is the option to the petitioner 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, tonight we have five, so you do have that option to make the request if you want to seek a continuance.

Second, you're going to need to explain the four elements necessary to establish the order for this Board to be able to grant a variance. Those four elements are:

1. That the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with the existing uses and zoning of nearby property;
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances which may include the 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 variance requested is the minimum variance 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 know you've filled out the forms that are in the packet that were posted online. We have a copy of that. But again, remember, you're here tonight because you are asking for an exception, so please make sure you cover those four. If you don't cover those four, if we don't think you've covered those four appropriately, we could deny your petition.

As for the order of operations, the Chairman or Chairperson will open each agenda item and provide introductory remarks. We will explain to the audience the difference between an objector testifying at the hearing -- sorry, are these new?

MR. OSOBA: I don't think so.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I don't remember that, and then there's an oath?

MR. OSOBA: Maybe that is an old copy; my apologies.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, that's all right. I'm going to improvise here. So, we've talked about the four elements. All right, let's talk about when we go through each petition.

So, I'm going to call you up here, I'm going to swear you in. The Staff will give a report of your petition. You're going to go over that. The Board will ask you questions about those four elements. You're going to have the opportunity to be seated.

Do we have any registered objectors tonight?

MR. OSOBA: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, that makes it a little bit easier. So, once you've sat down, if there is anybody in the public who wishes to comment on your petition, we'll call them up. They'll have an opportunity to speak. They'll have an opportunity to speak for three minutes and they'll be able to sit down. Then, you the petitioner will be able to address any of their concerns; whether they are in support, whether they are in opposition, you'll have an opportunity to come back and comment to those.

What I will ask members of the public is that there is a separate agenda item for just general public comment. If you come up for the petition, my ask is that you comment specifically about that petition. If you'd like to make any comments about how the Village is run, the Chicago Bears, anything like that, there will be time for you to do that at the very end, okay?

So, once that piece is done, again if the petitioner does not want to respond to those comments, we will close it down for Board deliberation, again, at which time it would require four affirmative votes by this Board to approve your petition. I think that's probably the high points, right? Again, there will be time at the end if anybody wants to make any public comment in general.

Okay, let's get right then to new business, and we'll start with

Agenda Item A, 1225 North Walnut Avenue, ZBA #25-053.

How are you?

MR. PURDOM: Good.

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

MR. PURDOM: My name is Kevin Purdom. I'm with 1225 North Walnut Avenue.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District, and the Petitioner is proposing to construct a three-season room over their existing deck in the rear yard. The proposed addition will increase the floor area ratio to 0.48 where a floor area ratio of 0.45 is the maximum permitted by code.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 245 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.4 to allow a floor area ratio of 3,811 square feet or 0.48 where a floor area ratio of 3,566 square feet or 0.45 is the maximum.

Thank you.

MR. PURDOM: All right, so I'm representing my clients today. They weren't able to make it. They have four boys, so their family has been growing, and they want to have more indoor space during the summer where they can spread out.

So, they have an existing deck on the back of the house. We're proposing to finish that existing deck in the same location as a three-season room. That then puts us over the required FAR.

Its unique circumstance is because it's an existing deck but because we want to finish it off, it puts us above that. Just with the growing family, we want to be able to grow with them with the house that they have.

The Design Review had said that it was nicely designed that will match the existing house. The appearance of the proposed sunroom looks nicely done to fit with the design of the existing house.

It's the minimum amount. We're not asking for any additional variations. We meet the rear and the side yard setbacks.

Then the finishes that we use will be matching the existing house, so it doesn't just look like something that was plopped down at the end.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Frank, do you have lead on this?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes. In addition to the four kids, is it two --

MR. PURDOM: Two adults and four kids.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay.

MR. PURDOM: And they've had the house since 2018.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 2018. In the materials, it says that it's encroaching in the setback by a foot-and-a-half; is that right?

MR. PURDOM: The overhang was originally encroaching to that setback, but I believe we reduced it so that it does not.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, and it's just entirely over the existing deck?

MR. PURDOM: Yes. There are some stairs that go down that we're not covering, so we're not even taking up the whole deck as it is.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, okay. Any neighbor feedback for the proposed --

MR. PURDOM: They talked to the neighbor to the south which is to the right on the plan, and they are in full support. They haven't heard anything else from neighbors.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And you're aware of the Building and Life Safety's comments in the materials about the deck foundation being inspected?

MR. PURDOM: Yes, we're going to do that.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I don't have any more questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Did the property owners build this house new or they moved into it?

MR. PURDOM: I believe they moved into it but added an addition.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Was the deck part of that addition?

MR. PURDOM: I think so, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, so where I'm going with this was if they added the deck, you know, how long have they, how old are the four kids? I'm just trying to understand the sequence of events here, right?

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: They put the addition on with the deck, and now they're deciding they want to enclose it.

MR. PURDOM: When they originally built the deck, they wanted to do some kind of covering for it --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Right.

MR. PURDOM: -- because I went out there in the middle of summer and it's just beaming down, there's no covering. They didn't end up doing it at that time, I'm not sure why --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. PURDOM: -- and now they just want to add that, make it as a three-season room.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, any other questions, guys?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat. Thanks, Kevin.

Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this petition?

(No response.)

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

Do you want to start, Frank?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, and I feel that this is a reasonable ask. Petitioner has provided the relevant materials for us and has made a case with no disapprovals from the neighbors. So, I'm in favor of the petition as presented.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Comments?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I'd agree. I mean, we're not adding any impervious surface. The three-season room seems like it makes sense for what they're trying to accomplish and it does look like they have a need for this in the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I move to approve this variance as presented.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. PURDOM: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 638 SOUTH VAIL AVENUE - ZBA #25-054

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 23rd day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:10 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Village Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Village Planner

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Next is Agenda Item B, 638 South Vail Avenue, ZBA #25-054.

MR. GINNODO: Hi.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Hello.

MR. GINNODO: Keith Ginnodo, Kingsley + Ginnodo Architects, for 638 South Vail.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And your address?

MR. GINNODO: 314 North Pine.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a two-story addition that aligns the existing non-conforming principal structure. The addition is subject to design review and will receive administrative approval pending the outcome of their ZBA petition. The proposed addition is set back 4.72 feet on the south side of the lot and 4.46 feet from the north side lot line where the required setback is six feet on either side.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variations:

- A 1.78-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(b) to allow an addition set back 4.72 feet from the south side lot line where the required side yard setback is six feet, with an additional one foot for the eave; and
- A 2.04-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(b) to allow an addition set back 4.46 feet from the north side lot line where the required side yard setback is six feet, with an additional one foot for the eave.

Additionally, a letter of support with signatures from five neighbors were submitted earlier today, and I distributed that to each of you. That will be entered into the record. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. GINNODO: All right, so the owners are here, Sam and Nick Hostert. They have two children, 12 and 9. They've been in the house for about 10 years, and they are going to have another member of the family join them. Sam's mother will be coming and they're actually building a separate living space on the first floor for the mom/grandmother, and then they're going to move the kids and parents upstairs.

The first floor is asking for a little bit of extension on the north side to extend the garage. It's right now a single-car garage and they're hoping to, well, planning and hoping to get two cars, tandem-spaced, in there, and a little bit of storage for garage stuff. That's a one-story addition on that side. Then, on the south side, it's a two-story addition for the rest of the facilities programmed.

The existing building is 55 feet wide, and those setbacks are already non-conforming. So, our proposition is to go directly above the exterior walls and to build straight over the existing facility.

So, in the area, there are several one-and-a-half and two-story homes up and down the block. It's been in development and transition for a little while, so we're just kind of extending the existing character of the locality. It's already a non-conforming building, and aside from the zoning setbacks, we're well within all the other zoning parameters including all the impervious surface

coverage, FAR, et cetera.

So, the hardship is really that building within the footprint is going to be awkward and more expensive and make it difficult for them to actually take the square footage that they need for, especially the second floor, and the garage is already so small. We're not asking for more roof, we're just asking for depth in that regard.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is this one Mike?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes. I'm sorry, can you explain the garage, again? So, you said that the garage wall is going to be extended?

MR. GINNODO: Yes. So, we're keeping the north line and just running it backwards.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Just further down.

MR. GINNODO: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Okay. Okay, so it's pretty, to me it's, I don't have any other questions actually.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, anyone else have any?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I might have a couple. So, the garage, you're doing a tandem?

MR. GINNODO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is that how it works?

MR. GINNODO: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, I completely understand the existing non-conforming. Did you look at, because you're adding on at the back as well, did you look at bringing the house in so you didn't have it beyond that? And what does that do to the plan?

MR. GINNODO: Yes, it messes the plan up pretty good. It's also a lot more expensive because we're going to have to add extra concrete, more than what we're doing. So, it was looked at and we decided to go for the variation because it just was a lot more logical and conforming with the building that's there already.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, no other questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We got the letter from Staff just before the meeting began. So, it looks like there are five neighbors all on the same block which are advocating their support. Did you or the property owners hear any other feedback besides this?

MR. GINNODO: No, negative, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. GINNODO: There's one thing that I need to address, and that's the Building Department exercise about fire-proofing the exterior wall. That's easy to handle and we'll take care of it.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes, I mean, any other questions?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: No.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Okay, so to me it was pretty straightforward given its non-conformance. I had a similar situation myself so I know how difficult that can be. The extension of the garage just naturally flows backwards.

So, I think it's, you know, it makes sense. The fire, he acknowledged the fire-resistant wall, and no issues from any neighbors, in fact support from the neighbors. So, I'm in support of this.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We'll see if anybody else has got a comment and we'll, so you can have a seat.

MR. GINNODO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this petition?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Back to you, Mike.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: I think everything was said.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other comments on this one?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I agree with Mike.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I agree, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, same here.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes, motion to approve as it's stated.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'll second that.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. GINNODO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 1161 NORTH HICKORY AVENUE - ZBA #25-055

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 23rd day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:17 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Village Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Village Planner

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Agenda Item C, 1161 North Hickory Avenue, ZBA #25-055.

We don't have to swear them back in, correct?

MR. OSOBA: You may as well, just to make sure we're doing it correctly.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, your name, again?

MR. PURDOM: I'm still Kevin Purdom with JRC.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, and you're still at?

MR. PURDOM: I'm still at 113 Perth Road, Cary, and then I'm representing 1161 North Hickory.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. PURDOM: All right, so --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, wait, we're going to do Staff first.

MR. PURDOM: Oh, sure.

MR. OSOBA: The property at 1161 North Hickory Avenue is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to build a second-story addition on the existing one-story residence. In addition, a two-story addition is proposed in the rear yard. The existing side yard setback is 2.61 feet, and the Petitioner intends to maintain this setback for the second-story addition and the proposed two-story addition in the rear of the property. The required side yard setback is 10 percent of the lot width, or five feet for this lot.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 2.39-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(b) to construct a two-story frame addition 2.61 feet from the north side property line where a minimum side setback of five feet is required.

MR. PURDOM: All right, so JRC Design Build bought this lot last year and they're doing a spec house where it's a not full tear-down. We're doing a full remodel of the first floor, adding a second floor, and then a small addition on the back to get more room to a family room.

The existing side yard is non-conforming, so we are proposing just to build inline with that non-conforming. It's a small lot as it is, 50 feet.

In Design Review, we were approved. So, it meets the locality design.

The existing lot is non-conforming. We're not asking for any further variances besides that side yard encroachment.

Then, if we tried to push it in to conform with that setback, it would throw off the flow of the first floor and the usability of the second floor in the bedrooms.

Then, we will address the Engineering Department/Fire Protection on the wall that encroaches into the side yard.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes, just a few questions. Neighbor feedback, pro or con?

MR. PURDOM: We haven't heard anything negative. Haven't heard anything from anyone actually.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Have you actually talked to any of the neighbors, not door knocking?

MR. PURDOM: We haven't done any door knocking, no, but we sent out the required letters. We haven't heard from anyone.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Is there anyone living in the house now or not?

MR. PURDOM: Not right now, no.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, in reading the notes from the Design Commission meeting, I believe there were some resident feedback and then some feedback from the Design Commission. Did you alter or modify any of the plans that you proposed for that, as a result of that feedback?

MR. PURDOM: The only thing that, we're going to, it will be addressed with the permitting, but we're keeping one roofline, that doesn't change the setback that we're asking for, but we're meeting all the requirements to get approval.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, with the addition, did you consider flipping it to the other side so that it works? I don't know what's in that space, it just shows me why at this point in time.

MR. PURDOM: No, we didn't. We're trying to keep as much as we can, and because it's a detached garage in the back, we didn't want to pinch where that car would then turn into the two-car garage. So, if we moved it to the other corner and kind of flipped the plan, you would lose space to angle into the larger part of the driveway going back.

Does that make sense?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions from the Board?

Jeff, are you done?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I think so.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat.

Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this petition?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Tom, you want to start us off?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Sure.

They've received Design Commission approval. They're aware of the other comments from our Staff. There's no neighbor lack of support or neighbor issues that we know of. No one is here to comment on that. I think they've met our criteria and I'm in favor of it, and it's existing non-conforming.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I mean, I certainly understand the existing non-conforming use of the original house. I do wish people would kind of look at adjusting their plans as possible to not have additions be non-conforming as well but, you know, I do think in this situation with the two-car garage, I could get behind this one.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Also, the tightness of the lot, too, makes that less possible.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, for me this was one where, I read it on

paper and I'll be honest, I had concerns. I actually drove by the house and there's, between this property and then the adjacent property to the north and south, they are very odd-shaped lots. They are very tight, and the current house is not inhabited. There's plywood on the windows. There's a window-well window that's open. I mean, I think it would be in the Village's best interest to get moving on this.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Absolutely agree.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I move that we approve this as presented.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. PURDOM: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:24 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 107 SOUTH PRINDLE AVENUE - ZBA #25-056

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 23rd day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:24 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Village Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Village Planner

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Moving on to Agenda Item D, 107 South Prindle Avenue, ZBA #25-056.

Good evening.

MR. FLUBACKER: Good evening. How are you doing? I'm Bob Flubacker of Robert Flubacker Architects. We're at 1895 Rohlwing Road in Rolling Meadows.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: The property at 107 South Prindle Avenue is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to demolish an existing home at 107 South Prindle and to construct a new one on the 8,710 square-foot property. The existing home is a one-and-a-half story residence with building footprint of 1,055 square feet. The proposed home is a two-story residence with a building footprint of 1,806 square feet. The proposed floor area ratio is 4,103 square feet or a floor area ratio of 0.47, where the maximum code allowance is 3,920 square feet or a floor area ratio of 0.45.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 183 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.4 to permit a total floor area ratio of 4,103 square feet or 0.47 where 3,920 square feet or 0.45 is the maximum.

In addition to this variance request, it should be noted that the Petitioner must submit for Design Commission for review and approval prior to any building permit issuance.

MR. FLUBACKER: Good evening. I'll just actually jump right in to the four criteria.

What we're proposing is a tear-down and new construction in a neighborhood that's got a mix of new and old homes, that's got a mix of one-story and two-story houses. So, this house will clearly fit the single-family character of the neighborhood, as well as we have designed the structure so that almost all, I think all the rooflines spring from the first floor to try to reduce the impact of the mass of the house and have it fit within the neighborhood and some of the smaller houses that are in the neighborhood.

The unique circumstances here are several. The family has owned the house since 1960. Since I'm an old guy and I've worked here for a long time, they've actually owned the house from before when the FAR on this lot was 0.5. So, the Village actually, in the process of time passing, has taken away buildable FAR on this lot; not that that matters but I'd like to say it.

My client is here. As you can see, they have a handicapped son. So, the need for the additional space is primarily due to servicing the needs of that child. There is a first-floor bedroom/bath suite. There is a room next to that bedroom that is a potential caregiver suite. They also have an elderly parent that may be moving into the house and they have elderly parents that stay over at the house often.

The primary area that increases the FAR is in the garage. The garage has been increased so that access into and out of cars hopefully self, what's the word I'm looking for? So that he can do it on his own rather than with someone, so we need some extra space to get in and out of the car. Also, there's

some extra space required so they can do a ramp into the house within the garage.

The spirit and intent of the chapter is always a tough one for me. It fits within the 14 criteria that are listed in the Zoning Ordinance. I don't want to go through them and bore you with all of those, but I think we meet the intent. We're doing everything we can to try to reduce the impact of the house to the neighborhood and not building a two-story box that would kind of overwhelm what's in there. So, I believe that we're being friendly to the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and the neighborhood.

The 183 square feet of variation we're asking for is basically exactly what the garage is over, when we design these houses we kind of look at attached three-car garages as a 700-foot element on the house. This garage is 183 square feet larger than that 700 square-foot element, and again it's really basically providing the extra maneuvering room within the garage.

So, with that, I'll be happy to entertain your questions.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Just a couple for you, Bob. For my own edification, is a detached garage counted as part of the FAR?

MR. FLUBACKER: No, it is not.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, if you had kept it detached, you wouldn't even have to be worried about this, but that wouldn't have worked for the family, is that your --

MR. FLUBACKER: Correct, correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it.

MR. FLUBACKER: And the transition from a detached garage into a remote house would be difficult.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Difficult, I understand. I get it.

MR. FLUBACKER: But, yes, to answer your question, you have up to 700 square feet that you can do a detached garage.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Correct, yes.

MR. FLUBACKER: In the attached garage, only 400 square feet is credited.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, no, I understand where you're on that. I have no other questions. I think you've done a great job answering the questions that were earlier provided.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do you know if the property owners talked about the project with their neighbors?

MR. FLUBACKER: They happen to be here tonight, the neighbor most affected on the garage side. Hopefully it's to be supportive.

MR. SNYDER: I'm right here.

MR. FLUBACKER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Plot twist, right?

Any other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, thank you.

MR. FLUBACKER: Great, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thanks, Bob.

All right, so if there's anybody present who wishes to comment

on this petition, they can step forward at this time.

MR. SNYDER: I'm supportive.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Sorry, a little more formal than that. We just need your name.

MR. SNYDER: Bill Snyder.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And then --

MR. SNYDER: 103 South Prindle, just to the north of them. This is Brianna right here. Yes, we're in support of it. It's a nice addition to our area.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Very good, thank you.

MR. SNYDER: Anything else to that?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Very good, thank you.

Is there anyone else present?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so Bob, did you want to comment to that or are you good?

MR. FLUBACKER: No. I'm fully in support of his support.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Very good.

All right, we'll close it down for deliberation.

Can you start us off, Jeff?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, absolutely. I'm, you know, fully in support of this. I think it's a great design. I love the fact that the family is trying to stay here and do what they're doing. Love that the neighbors are in support. The fact that you could have a detached garage and not even need this variance to me kind of speaks to it in and of itself. So, I absolutely support this.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to approve as presented.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: 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 very much.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:31 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 16 NORTH STRATFORD ROAD - ZBA #26-001

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 23rd day of February, 2026 at the hour of
7:31 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Village Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Village Planner

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, and then our final agenda item for new business, Item E, 16 North Stratford Road, ZBA #26-001.

Why don't we just wait a minute? Thank you.

How are you?

MR. BERTA: Good. How are you guys doing?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Good. Your name and address?

MR. BERTA: John Berta, 422 North Hough Street, Barrington.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: The property at 16 North Stratford Road is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing to build an addition to extend the existing two-car garage into the front yard. The front yard in the R-3 District is established by the average of the existing setbacks for the homes that are on that same street. The Petitioner provided the average front yard setback exhibit that yielded an average of 30.42 feet on the west side of North Stratford Road. The existing setback for the subject property is 32.59 feet, and the Petitioner proposes to shift the garage an additional six feet into the front yard.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variance:

- A 3.83-foot variance from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(a) to construct a building addition 26.59 feet from the front property line where a minimum front setback of 30.42 feet is required.

MR. BERTA: Okay, so I'm with Capital Architects and we represent the homeowners of this property. They purchased this property back in 2022. It's a typical two-story residential home with a, it's like a half basement on this property. They have now, the family is growing, they have three children. As time is coming, more and more space is required for all the activities that these kids are participating in and will continue to do so.

So, the scope of work is to make the garage larger to accommodate all the sports gear, bikes, things like that. Right now, it's a 20-foot by 20-foot garage. Also, with that expansion is to bring a mudroom into the floor plan of the house. That purpose is so coming in from the garage, they can unload all their activities, schoolbags, things like that, because right now the foyer is a smaller foyer, it's an older home, so it kind of makes it very difficult to bring everything into the house where it would be a lot easier if we just had the mudroom for all the activities.

Also, the homeowners wish to bring the laundry up to the first floor just because it's more of a, from the basement because like I said it's a smaller basement, it's not a full basement. It's one of those homes where it's like a half basement with a crawl. So, the idea is that they can get the laundry room upstairs. We can open up the basement a little bit more for the kids with their friends, things like that. Plus, the laundry on the first floor and the mudroom makes it a lot more easier for obviously travel distance for the clothes and stuff like that, you know, three boys, a lot of clothes, husband and wife, a lot of clothes.

So, the idea is we couldn't actually go, you know, with the mudroom to go over to the north which would be on the side. We didn't want to encroach in the back side yard setback. I mean, we only have about four feet there, so it wouldn't provide enough room to make, we want to make the garage

bigger, but to go even farther to get the mudroom there, it just wouldn't work. We'd have to go for a side yard setback variance. So, the idea was to come forward, provide the six-foot minimum that we need for the mudroom. I don't think we want to go any bigger than that, and then it still allows us to have additional garage storage to the north, which would be the side, and still get two cars inside.

So, the overall design is about the minimum that we could propose for the setback and not go to the north as well or the side. We didn't want to go into that direction with a setback variance as well.

So, the overall appearance is very similar to many of the homes on the street. You have your gable roof over the garage. As you can see, it's going to, once it's done, it will look like it was there from day one. I mean, the brick of the existing house is painted. It will be, the brick will be painted to match the existing brick and then we'll just do a gable roof to kind of give it a little more presence on the street. Like I said, it blends in with the neighborhood pretty much up and down the street and all around it.

Then the setback of the 26 feet, I know on our side of the street it's a little bit more than what you typically find, but I mean, literally across the street, some of those are like 26-27 feet. So, unfortunately, I can't, I don't think I could present those on that side, it's the average of our side, but we are pretty much matching those on the opposite side of the street as well.

For now, I think that pretty much covers our presentation.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do you know if the homes on the opposite side of the street are approximately the same age?

MR. BERTA: Yes, yes. It's, I think it's from the 60's or 70's. They would be the typical two-story, some are ranch, I think there's a couple of ranches as well.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, and how big would you say this mudroom is expected to be?

MR. BERTA: It's six feet is the width, and then we're doing the 20 feet, 24 feet of the width of the garage. So, six feet will give us the minimum for a washer and dryer and some clearances for cubbies and areas to hang their clothes and schoolbags for the kids. Then it will give us about a 24-foot garage on the inside so it's not like super deep but it's deep enough to get the cars in and still walk around.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How many cars do the property owners have?

MR. BERTA: Two.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And you said three children?

MR. BERTA: Three children, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How old are they?

MRS. RABE: 13, 9 and 6.

MR. BERTA: I kind of forgot.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, and then has this project been discussed with the neighbors?

MR. BERTA: It has been, and actually we have a couple here of the neighbors to support that. No negative letters have been sent or addressed to us.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We're good?

All right, thank you, you can have a seat.

MR. BERTA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this petition?

MS. POLIFKA: Hi, Jenica Polifka, 104 North Stratford, two houses down from them. We're one of the houses that was originally built with the garage further out than everybody else. So, we're in full support of them because it's not going to be any different than many of the houses on the street.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

Would you like to respond to that?

MR. BERTA: No, I think what she says is true.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

All right, so we can close it down for deliberation.

I guess I'm satisfied with the four areas that were outlined by the Petitioner. I think there are some unique circumstances here given what they want to build. I don't see or heard of any neighbor opposition. So, I think this is a relatively reasonable request.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'd agree, and taking a look on Google Earth Pro and some quick measurements, it certainly looks like the neighbors across the street actually are closer than your side of the street. So, I don't see where that's going to change the neighborhood in any way, shape or form. So, I can agree as well.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Move to approve the petition as presented.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MRS. RABE: Thank you.

MR. BERTA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do we have other business?

MR. OSOBA: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody present who wishes to make any public comment about anything?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Move to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Good night.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.)

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