

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 1919 NORTH CHESTNUT AVENUE - ZBA #26-002

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 13th day of April, 2026 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
THOMAS DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, let's call this month's Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order, beginning with roll call.

- MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.
- COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Here.
- MR. OSOBA: Mr. O'Connor.
- COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Here.
- MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.
- COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Here.
- MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.
- COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Here.
- MR. OSOBA: Mr. Siavelis.
- COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Here.
- MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.
- CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Here.

Next, we'll recite the Pledge of Allegiance. If everybody could please stand and face the flag in the rear of the room?
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, next up, we need to approve the minutes from our last meeting in February.

Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes?
(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?
(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, next, we're going to cover the hearing procedures. So, think of this as basically the order of operations for the evening.

First, quorum in voting. So, 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 six; you'll need to go four for six. One of our Board members might need to leave a little early. If you are a petitioner after that exit, just think about it; at that point, you'll need to go four for five.

Variation hardship. So, look, you're here because you're asking for an exception. You've all filled out the documents, we've had an opportunity to review it, but our expectation is that when you come to the podium, you're proactive in explaining the four elements which are necessary for us to be able to grant you a variation.

So, as a reminder, 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 the 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, again, I can't remind you enough, it's your opportunity to make the case to us on why we should be granting these exceptions.

Sequence of events. The Chairperson will open the agenda item and provide introductory remarks. We'll then have Staff give a presentation and a brief overview of the project and variance request. At that point, the applicant will 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 applications. Speakers must be sworn under oath and state and spell their name clearly. Anyone who has formally registered in advance of the hearing as an objector shall be permitted to speak first.

We do not have any registered objectors?

MR. OSOBA: No.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, if there were, they must complete a form to be provided by the Department of Community Development and submitted to the Director of Community Development no later than 4:30 p.m., five days before the scheduled date of the hearing. Any 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 has 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.

Can you pull the agenda up real quick? I'd like to make the one distinction. So, folks, what I just talked about was public comment. If you're going to come and make comment, make it specific to this variance. We have a section at the end of the meeting if you want to make a comment in general about any topic whatsoever, but if you're coming up to the podium, please have your comments specific to that variance.

The applicant -- is there any way to focus the screen? It looks like it's a little wobbly in case people need to view them?

MR. OSOBA: No, I think it might just be the projector. We can try to zoom in. Here.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, that's better.

MR. OSOBA: Just scroll through like that.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You don't have a, oh, isn't this the remote right here for the projector?

MR. OSOBA: The projector is a separate, yes, a separate thing.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I was going to say if this is the remote for it, I guess this isn't the remote.

MR. OSOBA: The remote is for the TVs.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Oh, okay. All right.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, after public comment, the applicant may make a closing statement and may present any follow-up testimony or evidence. The applicant will then rest their case. The Board will then deliberate. We will make a motion to close public testimony; we will deliberate and vote 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.

So, let's get started with tonight's new business. Agenda Item A, ZBA #26-002, 1919 North Chestnut Avenue.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Good evening. My name is Jay Stockbridge, Stockbridge Architects. I'm here --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: What's your address, Jay?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: P.O. Box 71, Burlington, Illinois.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: The subject property at 1919 North Chestnut Avenue is zoned R-2 One-Family Dwelling District. The Petitioner is proposing several building additions on an existing residence at 1919 North Chestnut Avenue, including the relocation of the attached garage, a second-story addition, and first floor expansions.

The existing home is a two-story split-level residence with a building footprint of approximately 1,685 square feet. The proposed home is a two-story residence with a building footprint of 2,800 square feet. The existing home is on a lot width of 70 feet where 75 feet is the minimum required lot width in the R-2 One-Family Dwelling District. The Petitioner is not proposing any alteration to the lot width, but is requesting this variation to bring the substandard lot width into conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.

There are building additions proposed on the north side and south side of the property. The north side building addition, which is relocating the attached garage, encroaches 0.7 feet into the required seven-foot side yard setback to align with the existing northern wall of the home. The south side yard building addition is set back 7.3 feet from the south side property line and, therefore, does not encroach into the required setback.

The building additions in the front of the home are set back at 30 feet where the minimum front yard setback established by the average of the existing homes in the block is 32 feet. The front yard setback is 30.11 feet to the garage; however, the existing front yard setback condition is expanding due to the building additions along that front facade and would be required to comply with code. Lastly, a balcony is proposed on the second-story front facade which further encroaches two feet into that required front setback.

Therefore, the following variances would be requested:

- A five-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.2 to permit a 70-foot lot width where 75 feet is the minimum;
- A 0.7-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.3(b) to permit a side yard setback of 6.3 feet where 7.0 feet is required;
- A two-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.3(a) to permit a front yard setback of 30 feet where 32 feet is required; and
- A two-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.6-5.1 to permit a new balcony to encroach into the required front yard setback.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You can go ahead.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Got it. As Dan has stated, we are here petitioning for four variances relating to an addition to be built on that existing home. The first variance is regarding the width of the lot. The Zoning Ordinance states that we're required to have a 75-foot-wide lot. This lot and the lot next to it and the other lot next to it are both 70 feet as are several other lots on the block. I'm assuming they were platted that way maybe before the ordinance or maybe there was a PUD or something, I don't know because I could not find the history on the dates and whatnot of the platting.

So, we're asking to go from 75 feet to 70 feet, not to grow the lot. They are big lots. They're quite deep lots there, but we're not asking for a reduction in lots. I know there was some work across the street on a big lot that became several smaller lots. We're not requesting anything like that.

Regarding the use, as Dan stated, it's a single-family, existing single-family residence, split-level home built in, I think that was late 70's. It's kind of a 70's split-level design that's existing now and we are just looking to update that design, make it a little bit more livable for today's lifestyles and things like that.

The proposed use will be unchanged from the existing zoning. So, we're not asking for a zoning change. We want to keep it as a single-family residence. Our owners are here, Rick Pucci, Anya, and they're looking to move into that home as their home.

As I stated before, this lot and the six adjoining lots are all 70 feet wide. I've been out there, I measured some. I didn't get surveys on all of them so I can't a thousand percent say they're 70 feet, but I've measured them, taped them off, all of those. We did that when we were going to, we'll talk about that with the front yard setback and the average lot depth and all that. So, I've done some research out there and they're 70-foot-wide lots. So, I suppose this would be considered a unique circumstance, again because those lots were platted and subdivided prior to the 75-foot zoning ordinance. Excuse me.

I do believe that this variance, if granted, is in harmony with the spirit of the neighborhood. There's many homes out there now, the next block over, across the street, down the street, that have been substantially, either they're new homes or substantially remodeled from some of the older housing stock from the 70's and all. All the new work is, you know, it's a very modern, somewhat of a dense neighborhood side to side. It's not so dense depth-wise but it's kind of a dense side to side to side, and I think that this variance, if granted, is certainly within the spirit and the intent of the Chapter.

It is the minimum variance required. As I said, we're not

asking for a 60-foot-wide lot or anything like that. We know we need to do this, really if we want to do any work on this property, we need to go through and get the lot zoning cleaned up. So, it would stay an R-2, it would stay the same lot size, and I do believe it's the minimum variance necessary to reasonably use the property.

The second variance is regarding the north property line. This is the north property line down. Yes, that's fine, along here. This is the footprint of the existing house right here. This is the new garage we'll talk about in a minute, but this property, this building, the existing building along here is set per the survey at 6.33 feet I believe it is. Obviously, the required setback being seven feet, it's set at 6.33 feet, so no matter what we do, again, per Dan, we need to make sure that that's an allowable thing to do.

What we're asking, the existing house on that end is like a story-and-a-half tall. Then with the roof sloping to the south, well, this fascia line is like a story-and-a-half tall. The proposed addition would be taller than that because we're going to do away with the split-level design of the house. It just doesn't suit the owners, it's not set up, there's too many stairs, things like that.

So, the new wall along here would be taller by about five feet than the existing conditions, and the goal is to build it right on top of the existing wall. This is, we're not proposing to tear the house down. This is, although substantial, it is a remodel. So, right along here, the wall will be again about five feet taller.

To make some roof lines work and some foundations work, we are proposing to continue this wall line out here and construct a new garage. Right now, this garage comes in, it's an L-shaped driveway and it turns like this, and the garage door is right along this wall. So, this is the proposed new garage, and again the goal is to align it for some structural reasons, for some aesthetic reasons, to keep all that the same. This roof is a single-story and this roof would be lower than the existing roof and lower of course than the full two-story line that we're asking for here.

Again, we're not asking for an increase in the setback. It is what it is. We're just asking for permission to build on that wall, on top of the existing wall here, and then to work off that foundation and continue that wall along here at that same dimension of 6.33, don't quote me, 6.34 feet. It's --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: We get it. We get that point.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: It's about eight inches.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Again, this use is unchanged from the existing, and the variance request is to allow us to remodel that existing in a structurally sane way and at the same time bring kind of a modern touch to what's going on with the neighborhood and the design of the home.

We do believe that, you know, the owner has not caused this. It is where it is, so it's not, we don't feel that we are creating an undue burden on that neighborhood in this. Although this is new, this is, you know, an existing condition that we'd like to build on top of. Yes, 6.35.

I do think it's unique circumstances in that whenever this house was built, it was built over the line if the line was truly there. It could have

been surveyed incorrectly or whatever, but it was built, you know, where it was built. Excuse me.

Again, I think this variance request is in harmony with the intent of the ordinance and it's simply needed to be able to build on that wall and continue with the existing footprint of the house.

Again, it is a minimum variance to allow reasonable use of the property. We're asking for a variance over there of about, of approximately eight inches along that north wall.

Our third variance, the front yard variance. Can you zoom out so we can see those? Thank you.

The existing, this is the front of the existing house right here. The driveway comes in here and turns. Right, so this line right here, on the survey, we thought we were kind of golden when we saw the survey. The survey listed a 25-foot setback but we couldn't find any record of that in any of the deed and stuff. Then, in speaking with Dan, it may have been with Steve Hautzinger also, that's when I was informed that the setback is calculated on the street average.

Based on, there's a chart here, too, somewhere. Bottom line is we've measured all these, this shows all existing conditions, and the average calculated setback is 32 feet. This one is, I don't remember, it's tough to see there, 28, and I think this was like 26. This is a newer home that was built not too terribly long ago.

So, what we're asking here is that we would be able to build, similar to what I explained on this part of the wall right here, that we would be able to keep our existing foundation, our existing wall framing. This is going to become a living space in here, but be able to keep that foundation, keep that wall, and then build on top of it. That is currently at 30.11 feet, so we're asking for one-foot 10.5-inch variance at that front.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And if you don't get variance, what happens?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: There is a second floor above that in this design. Part of the second floor is set back and part of that second floor has like a little bay projection on it that sticks out.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You'd have to tear down part of the house.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Well, worst case is we'd have to tear down part of the house, you know, I mean, over there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: When you took your averages, did you include your own?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Yes, yes. Yes, and there's a chart and it included our own at 30. So, if it doesn't go through, we'll have to push that second floor projection back or push the entire second floor back, and that does cause some structural issues.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, you would agree with me that that's a hardship.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: In my opinion, it's a hardship. I think both of them are hardships. So, yes, it to me is a hardship. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And No. 4?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: You want to move 4?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, I think we get it.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: We got you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, we're getting the drift.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Got you. So, the two, the north and south, or the north and west are setback issues. No. 4 has to do with the balcony right here. When I went in and met with Steve, he explained to me that we are allowed to have, there's a door out of a room right here, kind of a den/office on the first floor. He explained to me that we are allowed to have a covered entry over a door to the outside. So, we have a 4 x 10 little element right here, and there's a tree right here. It's really a nice tree, we really want to save it, because at one time we thought about just keeping the garage, pulling it in this way, don't want to lose the tree.

So, based on that, we have a covered, no matter what we would have a covered porch there. As part of the design, and talking with Steve and back and forth on some of that, we kind of came up with the idea to have a little second floor balcony above that covered porch. Can we go to some elevations?

That's all existing. That's the existing old house. Can you zoom in on that one? Thank you.

So, right here is that door to the first floor. This is the old garage. Right here is the door to the first floor, so we'd like to put a cover over that door. As part of the discussion on some of the massing of the design of the house, we thought it'd be nice to do a balcony up here off another door at the second floor. So, that's the need for the variance for the projection of the porch into that front yard setback.

Again, I think this is all in harmony with the spirit and intent of the document. You see a lot of homes in the area that are updated and have some of the same types of scale and features. I think it's in harmony with what's going on in the neighborhood.

Can you go to the existing house? I just want to show you that real fast.

Some people would like this house and some people may not prefer that house. I'm sure at one time it was kind of neat, but that's what it kind of looks like now. This is where that door is and that balcony would be here, the new second floor would be built over this. All this, you know, roof comes out. It's a pretty substantial remodel.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I do have a few questions for you.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, owners are moving into this brand new? So, I'm assuming buying and remodeling for the house, correct?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: They've already purchased the house and intend to move in.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it, very good.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: It's not a builder's spec, flip or any of that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Like all I hear then, for sure.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Right.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Have you talked to the neighbors? Any feedback from any of the neighbors?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: We did speak with the neighbors. Mr. Pucci, I gave him, we got our list from Dan. I conveyed it to the three immediate neighbors across the street and the two to each side, and I know he's gone over and spoken with, I think one of them was not home but left a note, and we left them this package.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Sure.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: We left all, the three of them this full package. Would you like to --

MR. PUCCI: No, on the one that wasn't home, I followed --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Sorry, we've got a procedure here. You need to come up; you've got to state your name and then you can proceed.

MR. PUCCI: Rick Pucci.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

MR. PUCCI: I'd be the owner, and I did speak to all three of the neighbors. The one that wasn't there, I did follow up and we spoke over the telephone. They all gave us a --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: They're all positive?

MR. PUCCI: Yes, all three of them did.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Excellent, thank you.

MR. PUCCI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: The only other question I have is kind of a design one. I understand the three existing nonconforming issues. Those are all there, you can't change those.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: With, and the two setbacks.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, the only, well, the one question I have is you're extending the garage straight up, which I understand aesthetically and all. The other side of the house has a seven-foot setback that would have, had you matched that, you'd have stayed in line, at least what's shown up on the survey.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: What do you mean the other --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Based on the existing survey I'm looking at.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Just so I understand.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: On the south side, there's a small setback there right at the garage it looks like.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Oh, right here?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. Did you consider that on the other side?

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: I did not consider that one bit because what we were talking about in our design was we were going to grow this wall to align with this. We were going to take this foundation out and --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Oh, got you. So, that one is lining up to match that regardless, okay.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: And we have, we're less than, it doesn't show up but 804 minus 71, we're still under the 7, or over the 7 over there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, you're still under the 7, yes, you still have --

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: So, since we were going to do that there, we wanted to do that on that side.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You were lining it up also, okay, that makes sense to me. The patio being, you know, I kind of like the look of it personally, I don't really have an issue with that. So, that's it for my questions.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And you've got support across the board from Engineering, on all fronts.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, everybody was very supportive.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: I have not seen that document but I'm glad to hear it. I know we had support from the Architectural review, and we need to fully engineer, you know, the site and all that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

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

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Thank you.

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

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. No, let me start. As I said, you've got three existing nonconforming uses that the owner can't be really responsible for. I think they're doing a nice job. They have Staff support. They have support from the neighbors.

The balcony I think actually is the one that they could have changed, and I'm with them, I don't think I would. I think it goes very nicely with the house and the neighborhood. So, I'm in support of all of these.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I agree with those comments and assessment.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to approve the variances as presented.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: 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: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Okay, congratulations.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome to stay, but you're free to
leave.

MR. STOCKBRIDGE: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-
mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 615 SOUTH HARVARD AVENUE - ZBA #26-003

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 13th day of April, 2026 at the hour of
7:28 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
THOMAS DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Agenda Item B, ZBA #26-003, 615 South Harvard Avenue. Good evening.

MR. PURDOM: Hello.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: State your name and address for the record.

MR. PURDOM: I am Kevin Purdom with JRC Design Build at 1275 Davis Street, Arlington Heights.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: The subject property at 615 South Harvard Avenue is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District. The Petitioner is proposing a four seasons room addition in the rear of the property. The building addition is proposed to be set back 18.75 feet from the rear property line where the required setback is 30 feet in the R-3 District. Additionally, the building addition would increase the square footage of impervious surface on the subject property to exceed the maximum allowed coverage of 4,754 square feet.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variances:

- An 11.25-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(d) to construct a one-story addition which is set back 18.75 feet from the rear property line where 30 feet is required; and
- A 105 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.5(b)(2) to allow 4,859 square feet of impervious surface coverage where 4,754 square feet is the maximum allowed impervious surface coverage.

MR. PURDOM: All right, so my clients, Tom and Sue Rodell. Tom is here with us; they're the only ones living in the house. They bought the house about four years ago in 2022. It's a single-story ranch house that takes up a good chunk of their yard, and they want to be able to enjoy more of their backyard. Right now, there's a patio but they want to turn that patio into a four-season room off the bat.

So, where we run into the problem is the unique lot that we have. The back corner is clipped. The house, to the plan north, also has that same condition, it's just kind of a unique circumstance that exists that the owner has no control over. Our design was approved with no comments from Engineering or Building and Life Safety.

It's in harmony and spirit of the neighborhood. It's in the back of the house; it's not actually changing the look of the house. All the materials are to match the existing condition so that it looks like it wasn't an addition put on, it was always meant to be there.

The existing patio actually is over the square footage as well, so since we're replacing that patio with the four-season room, we're just kind of swapping out what is over the square footage already.

It's the minimum amount to be able to use that as a functional space. If we reduced any more what they would put in to making that addition doesn't really make sense, and if we did any kind of addition off the back, we would require a variance due to the rear yard setback. That clipping off that extra corner is what put us over the impervious square footage.

I believe that's all I have.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And you said you got feedback from the neighbors?

MR. PURDOM: Yes. So, he talked to all the adjacent neighbors and it was all positive feedback. He hadn't heard anything negative from anyone else.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You got this one, right?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I do, yes. I don't have any other questions. This is really straight-forward. So, I don't know if any other Board members have anything.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Kevin, to confirm, the impervious surface coverage is exactly the same from what you have now?

MR. PURDOM: There are rounded corners on the patio, so it might add a few extra.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Feet, right?

MR. PURDOM: Yes, feet, but it's in the same location to the same edge on all three corners.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. PURDOM: It's just --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: It's rounded in the first placement.

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, I'm good.

All right, you can have a seat, Kevin.

MR. PURDOM: Thank you.

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

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, with that said, we'll close it down for Board deliberation.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, I think this is really straight-forward, especially compared to the prior one. It's tucked behind the house, and like Kevin explained, that back corner of the lot is clipped at a pretty severe angle and a pretty significant reduction of that back lot. He wouldn't even be here without that. So, I'm in support of this. I think this is very reasonable.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I agree.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I agree, too.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll move.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: 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: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

MR. PURDOM: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Congratulations.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 901 NORTH PINE AVENUE - ZBA #26-004

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 13th day of April, 2026 at the hour of
7:33 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
THOMAS DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Next up is Agenda Item C, ZBA #26-004, 901 North Pine Avenue.

MR. HEDSTROM: How do you do?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How are you?

MR. HEDSTROM: Well, I was pretty good.

MRS. HEDSTROM: You have to state your name.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: If both of you could do it?

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes.

MR. HEDSTROM: Yes. My name is Rich Hedstrom, and this is my wife Marlene.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Marlene Hedstrom.

MR. HEDSTROM: Okay, and we live at 901 North Pine Avenue, Arlington Heights.

MRS. HEDSTROM: For the last 50 years.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, we're going to do the Staff report and then you can tell us why you want the fence.

MR. HEDSTROM: Okay, what we have --

MRS. HEDSTROM: Wait, wait.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: No, they're going to go first. It's okay, go ahead.

MR. HEDSTROM: All right. Again --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I'm sorry, we're going to ask, she's going to give an overview of your case first. Please proceed.

MS. NADEEM: All right, the Petitioner is proposing to replace an existing 42-inch-tall chain-link fence along Frederick Street with a 48-inch tall, black, open-style aluminum fence. The Applicant had previously received a variance in May 22, 1989 for the existing fence. The proposed fence will be in the same location as the existing fence, at the subject property's corner yard. Specifically, the fence will be located on the property line with a plus or minus 30-inch distance from the sidewalk.

Just a note, the last few points that I'm going to go through were amended for clarification. We went and discussed these items with the Applicant for further clarification regarding the landscape requirements. So, due to space limitations, the Petitioner was not originally proposing to place the required landscaping but will follow the previous approval from 1989 which calls for the fence to be adequately screened with shrubbery. The Zoning Ordinance in 1989 did not have provisions for requiring some landscaping adjacent to the fence; however, it was added by the ZBA from the 1989 case. This will still be a requirement as per the building permit review.

Therefore, the Applicant is requesting the following variation:

- A six-inch variance from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3(b)(2) to allow a fence height of 48 inches, increasing from a previously-approved 42-inch fence in the corner yard.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

Okay, you're up.

MR. HEDSTROM: Okay, All right, I've got to tell you a little story.

MRS. HEDSTROM: No, we don't have time for stories.

MR. HEDSTROM: No, okay. I was hurt very bad, I was run over by a car, broke my back, major head trauma, and I was supposed to die. Quiet. I didn't, okay.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes. We've been married for 50 years.

MR. HEDSTROM: Now, Dr. Jimenez at Lutheran General, he came in, he said you're one lucky son of a bitch; you're supposed to be dead at 70. Well, I didn't die.

MRS. HEDSTROM: He has metal holding most of his body together.

MR. HEDSTROM: What he told me is they were amazed that I lived. Okay, that's neither here nor there, and that I would probably never walk again because I broke my back. I didn't sever it, I broke it.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes, and all the ribs, the pelvis, both legs --

MR. HEDSTROM: When we left, when I left the hospital at about four weeks, I went to four months rehab facility where I literally had to learn to walk, and I did, okay. Dr. Jimenez told me something then. He said, you know what, you're going to have some tough times. I said yes, no shit. What we would like to do, I'd like you to get a comfort dog. He said --

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes, because two years or three years of recovery. He wasn't doing good emotionally. He also had cancer, he also has afib with his heart condition.

MR. HEDSTROM: Well, that's from the military.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Agent Orange, I know, but anyway --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: That's all good background. So, let's talk about why you want the fence.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes.

MR. HEDSTROM: What happened, I got a comfort dog, a beautiful dog, okay. July to August, like at the end of July, beginning of August, it just died. Cancer, it just dropped dead. It was a shot in my heart. I was going right down the tubes, I admit it.

Then, we said, okay, we're going to get another dog. We got one down in Joliet, a little dog. The dog came out and laid at my feet, and I said this is it; I want this dog. So, we got it.

MRS. HEDSTROM: After two months of searching.

MR. HEDSTROM: It was starving and had all problems, so we took care of all that. Then we noticed something.

MRS. HEDSTROM: She got healthy.

MR. HEDSTROM: This dog when she was healthy is a runner --

MRS. HEDSTROM: And a jumper.

MR. HEDSTROM: -- and she can jump over my fence. Now, if you take a look at where we're located on Pine and Frederick, that's kitty corner from St. James.

MRS. HEDSTROM: And also a block from Arlington Heights Road.

MR. HEDSTROM: Yes, and at St. James, you go there in the morning when the morning service is getting out and the kids are going to school,

don't go on the street, that will kill you, okay, or after school, the traffic.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay, they get it.

MR. HEDSTROM: And then we've got Frederick on the side and that's St. Viater expressway. So, when St. Viater gets out, it's like pedal to the metal, boom, we're gone. So, I'm looking at this and I'm thinking, oh, geez, I can't let my dog here. So, we looked around and looked around, I talked to a lot of people on fencing, and we came up with an idea of an aluminum fence. I think we have a picture.

MRS. HEDSTROM: They got pictures, go ahead.

MR. HEDSTROM: Okay, an aluminum fence that has, yes, you see these slats are up and down.

MRS. HEDSTROM: So, you can't get --

MR. HEDSTROM: And that's what, and we only wanted four feet. So, what I'm saying is my fence right now is chain-link and it's 3.5 feet. So, what I'm saying guys is I'm only asking for six inches, that's it, you know.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Tom, go ahead and start the questions.

MR. HEDSTROM: And that's, so I want to replace the fence with this which is beautiful. If I can get it, we've already got a contractor.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay, the hardship really is that since we've been trying to get this fence, we've had to walk the dog on a leash.

MR. HEDSTROM: In the backyard.

MRS. HEDSTROM: In the backyard because we don't trust it. We just spent \$2,000 and had him away two weeks to try to train her.

MR. HEDSTROM: In a training facility.

MRS. HEDSTROM: To come and not to jump. It's not working.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, let me ask you something real quick and then Tom can take it. Your dog can get over, jump over the existing fence.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Exactly.

MR. HEDSTROM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That's why you believe you need a taller fence because your 42-inch height the dog clears.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, there we go, that's it.

MRS. HEDSTROM: That's it.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I have some questions. You've done a good job of setting us up for it. Thank you, and thank you for your service, by the way.

MR. HEDSTROM: Thank you, I appreciate that. Thank you for --

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay, let them talk.

MR. HEDSTROM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: So, we understand what you're asking for. Have you talked to your neighbors?

MR. HEDSTROM: Oh, absolutely.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes, they all think this is ridiculous that we can't, because there's other fences exactly like what we want to put in the area, the same

height.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: But are they in favor or do they have any issues with your new fence?

MR. HEDSTROM: No, they want it.

MRS. HEDSTROM: No, they would rather have it.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Are any of them here tonight?

MRS. HEDSTROM: No, but they could have if I'd known that that would have helped.

MR. HEDSTROM: They like the dog, it's a very beautiful little --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: What's the dog's name?

MRS. HEDSTROM: Ms. Ginger.

MR. HEDSTROM: Ms. Ginger. She's a southern gal from Tennessee.

MRS. HEDSTROM: But, okay, about the shrubbery, we have put shrubbery there. It keeps dying because it's so close to the sidewalk.

MR. HEDSTROM: Well, my first dog was a male, it peed on them.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes, it always peed on them.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: If this gets approved tonight, my understanding is you will work with the Village Staff, they'll work with you to come up with some sort of a compromise that works for everybody, whether it's shrubs or planting, whatever goes there.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes, whatever.

MR. HEDSTROM: Oh, yes, we're not opposed to that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, great. We're going to keep moving. There was a comment by one of our Staff departments; I want to make sure you're aware of it --

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: -- and I don't think it's any big issue but it says to revise, you have to revise the plat to indicate the type of fence style and material and where the fence line is at on the plat.

Apparently, that, in my understanding, that's not up to date; is that right, Dan?

MRS. HEDSTROM: I don't know if it is or not but we're putting it exactly where this fence that's been there 37 --

MR. HEDSTROM: We're just taking the old fence out and putting this one in.

MRS. HEDSTROM: It's been there 37 years.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes, I understand.

MRS. HEDSTROM: We just want to put it in the exact same spot.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I understand that, but is that correct?

Dan, that was the note?

MS. NADEEM: Yes, that's something that we require for fences during building permitting. We require the plat to also indicate that.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Just part of the process then.

MS. NADEEM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, what we're saying is if this gets

approved, if we approve your request, that means you get to get your extra six inches. You still need to work with the Village to make sure your permit process is accurate and complete. So, what Tom is just telling you is you're going to have to make sure you get that step completed.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay, so how long, can you put the fence up and zoom because this is --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: That's something you can work with the Village on.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Ma'am, you can go online, these are all posted online. You can see what their comments are. It's just a couple of sentences, easy enough to find.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And your fence contractor should be able to submit the permit.

MR. HEDSTROM: We have a fence contractor.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Yes.

MR. HEDSTROM: At this point, it's --

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes, we don't need that information. You can work with the permitting --

MR. HEDSTROM: We may get another one, I don't know what happened.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I don't have any other questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I'm good.

Peter?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No more.

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

MRS. HEDSTROM: Okay.

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

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, Tom, would you like to --

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I would, I would. I think they've done a very good job of covering all the four points we look for, especially the hardship issue. You've spoken with your neighbors; there doesn't seem to be any issue there.

MRS. HEDSTROM: No.

MR. HEDSTROM: No.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: It's a reasonable request. It's hitchhiking on top of something you asked for back in the 80's.

MRS. HEDSTROM: 37 years ago.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: 37 years ago, and there really is no push-back from any of the three departments who give us feedback. So, I'm in favor of this.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I agree.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Me, too.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Move to approve this as presented.

MR. HEDSTROM: And we have to see who?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Assuming you get your votes. So, is there
a second?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, let's go to a vote.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. O'Connor.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. HEDSTROM: Thank you very much.

MRS. HEDSTROM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

MR. HEDSTROM: We'll be contacting you for that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Your fence contractor can probably
take care of that for you. Just make sure they get the permit.

MR. HEDSTROM: Gentlemen, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Have a good evening, folks.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Have fun with Ms. Ginger and the new
fence.

MRS. HEDSTROM: We will. Thanks a lot.

MR. HEDSTROM: Well, if you're ever in the area, I have a wicked
bourbon.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I'll bring glasses. Good to know.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-
mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 820 NORTH DUNTON AVENUE - ZBA #26-005

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 13th day of April, 2026 at the hour of
7:44 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
FRANK PORTERA
MICHAEL O'CONNOR
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
THOMAS DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, let's go to Agenda Item D, ZBA #26-005, 820 North Dunton Avenue.

MR. NEMETH: Hi, good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Hi, if you can state your name?

MR. NEMETH: Chris Nemeth.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And your address?

MR. NEMETH: 820 North Dunton Avenue.

(Witness sworn.)

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 One-Family Dwelling District, and the Petitioner is proposing to construct a second-story addition and a porch. The proposed addition is set back 25.3 feet from the front lot line. The proposed improvements will increase the property's impervious surface coverage to 65.12 percent, and the proposed addition is 25.34 feet high.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variations:

- A 6.7-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(a) to allow an addition that is set back 25.3 feet from the front lot line where the required minimum setback is 32 feet;
- A 632 square-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.5(b)(1) to allow an impervious surface coverage of 4,070 square feet or 65.12 percent of the lot where the maximum allowed by code is 3,438 square feet or 50 percent; and
- A 0.34-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.6 to allow a building height of 25.34 feet where the maximum allowed by code is 25 feet high.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, go ahead.

MR. NEMETH: Yes, I hope to make this quick, but I think based on the work that we've done with our architects, (a) we're not going to be changing the proposed use in which, you know, the home is used for. I think the attempt is to modernize and taking a 100-year-old home and making it livable for dual working from remote, so we both work remote primarily. So, having an additional space upstairs will help the plight of the owner in that regard. Then, just due to the addition on the second story, it does require us to increase the elevation of the home just slightly. I think that's a very small, the smallest of the requested variances.

Then, based on, you know, the front steps are in pretty bad condition as I speak. So, you know, those facade bricks or whatever comprises that are peeling away and we need to do front step and porch repair. So, as part of this project, we were hoping to widen the front porch and get a little bit more depth toward the street to make it a usable, you know, front porch.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How many people live in the house?

MR. NEMETH: Four.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And how long have you owned it?

MR. NEMETH: Five years. Six, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, the variances you're asking for on the front yard setback and the impervious surface coverage, do you know what's your existing front yard setback and your existing impervious surface coverage?

MR. NEMETH: I want to say the front setback is roughly 31, I'd have

to take a look at the plans.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Does Staff know?

MR. BOJIN: Yes, 33 and a third, 33 feet and 3 inches.

MR. NEMETH: Back to the front of the home?

MR. BOJIN: Yes.

MR. NEMETH: Okay, I was thinking off of the, excuse me, the lot to the steps.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's your current, do you know what your current impervious surface coverage is?

MR. NEMETH: I think it's roughly 55 percent, and I think that's already over what the allotted is based on the plat. So, I think given the front porch addition, we're only, you know, if you did a calculation on that, I think it's only, you know, 220 to 240 additional square feet.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: In your notes, you said this project, you know, you're expanding the scope to improve the new front porch. So, can you add the upstairs bedroom and bathroom if the porch wasn't approved?

MR. NEMETH: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, you can?

MR. NEMETH: Yes, that's correct, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, have you talked to any of your neighbors about the project?

MR. NEMETH: I have.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's the feedback?

MR. NEMETH: I've had all positive feedback from, you know, all the residents, both north and south line properties. My wife talked to the gentleman across the street this morning. He said good luck with the hearing tonight.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And the porch, I mean, this is to the minimum, you know, variance acceptable, this is the smallest you can make it?

MR. NEMETH: To kind of stay in line with the proposed second-story addition roof line, you know, working with the architect, that kind of landed the best with, you know, how the front porch would look; otherwise, it would be too steep and, you know, too shallow.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: With this addition, the proposed addition, what's your total square footage in this house, but not including the front porch if possible?

MR. NEMETH: Not including the front porch, I'd have to get back to my numbers.

Joe, do you by chance know that?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Sorry, he'd have to come up. If he wanted to come up, we've just got to swear him in.

MR. NEMETH: Do you mind? If you have the numbers?

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

MR. COATH: Joe Coath, 413 South Cook Street, Barrington.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do we swear him in or he just has to say his name?

MR. OSOBA: We should swear him in.

(Witness sworn.)

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And what's your full name?

MR. COATH: Joe, Joseph Coath. I can't say, it's on our cover sheet, but I'm not --

MR. NEMETH: So, the question was square footage of the home not including the new addition, or the front porch?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No, square footage of the proposed new home exempting any inclusion of the new front porch.

MR. NEMETH: Okay.

MR. COATH: They're basically adding a large master bedroom upstairs. That's really all that's occurring upstairs in effect. I would guess offhand it's about 500 square feet would be added without the porch.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, so tell me the total number.

MR. COATH: Of the home?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Square footage without the porch. You can ballpark.

MR. COATH: It's like 2,500 square feet.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: 2,500, okay.

MR. OSOBA: Chair, through you, the estimated with the dimensions shown on the plan, the porch square footage is 273 square feet.

MR. BOJIN: And the floor area is 2,813. So, you subtract that, you get about 2,500 square feet.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And now you have those dimensions, the question I asked before, do we know what their current impervious surface coverage is?

MR. BOJIN: Yes, we do. It's about 58 percent, so it is a little bit over the maximum.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, 58 percent, and they're going up to or requesting 65 percent, okay.

Further questions?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, you're, I think what the Chairman, and I don't want to put words in your mouth so correct me if I'm wrong --

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We're actually aligned today.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, yes. So, why I think the Chairman is asking that question is the proposed variances, the proposed additions that bring you significantly over the ratio, right, up at that 60 percent, what was that number? 60-what? Proposed?

MR. BOJIN: What they're proposing? 65 percent.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: 65.

MR. BOJIN: Just about.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And you're up from about 58, okay, that's a 12 percent increase. Yes, that's a pretty healthy increase. So, why don't you tell us, this is your chance to explain why you need all that additional space for your family?

MR. NEMETH: Yes, you know, we've got two little kids and, you

know, again, safety of the front porch is a concern. So, we're going to, obviously we're doing a redo of at least the existing footprint, but having kids on a busy street like Dunton, you know, I have my parents, we've got grandparents that come over, it would be nice if they could have a, you know, a sizeable footprint on the front porch to be able to watch. Dunton is, on this portion of the block, part of the parade route. As you understand, there are a lot of people there. It would be nice to, you know, (a) have additional seating space there, and then I think it's just generally bringing the front look to a level that's commensurate in Arlington Heights and, you know, what we want the street to portray.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is the space underneath the floor, is that open? What's underneath your entryway?

MR. NEMETH: Currently or what's proposed?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: In this proposed plan.

MR. NEMETH: That would be, you know, closed off to lattice.

MR. COATH: Underneath the skirt?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, below the porch.

MR. COATH: Yes, that's just board spacing. That's a typical traditional board skirt. I'd say, you know, the depth of the board is a great benefit for this improvement because it makes that porch become, it is a traditional depth of a porch that size. Otherwise, if we start keeping it back, it starts becoming, you know, sort of like stage craft. It doesn't have the depth you would expect on a traditional porch. I think if you to set a chair on the porch and walk by it, you're trying to get about a seven-foot of footprint.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: That's, I think that's what Peter is talking about. That's what I'm, I don't know, I can't speak for the other Board members, that's what I'm kind of hung up with. Of your three requests, the height, no issue. I get what, you know, you're trying to put in a new bedroom, new bathroom, four inches, no big deal. But the asks here on the front yard setback and the impervious surface area coverage are not insignificant.

That's why I was asking what your existing measurements were because everybody's variance is unique. If your existing dimensions were already significantly over, okay, it's not as much of an impact. You're currently over on both but you're asking, in my opinion, for a lot more, and that's what I'm trying to understand, the hardship, and if that's the minimum or the smallest available porch that you think you could use to complete this project.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, to Ben's point, to the Chairman's point, the width of your porch, do you need that full width there? I mean, and that drawing, the front elevation that was just up on the screen, that's on our screens, you know, or at least on my screen, it looks like it has a nice proportion, right, to the width of your house, okay, and part of this is give and take with us, right? Do you need this full width here? Like is it essential to the aesthetic appearance of this house and the curb appeal? Because it is bringing you up, it is bumping up your percentage, right? I understand that there's really no structure underneath there, right, and I understand that point, you clarified that point.

But do you feel that you really need that width of that porch as drawn and shown on the screen?

MR. NEMETH: I think from a symmetry standpoint and a usability standpoint, I do.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: It looks like --

MRS. NEMETH: I guess I have a question, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, again, you've sat here all night, you know how it works.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes. Hi.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, what's your name?

MRS. NEMETH: Bri Nemeth.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And what's your address?

MRS. NEMETH: 820 North Dunton Avenue.

(Witness sworn.)

MRS. NEMETH: I guess I just want to ask a question, and I appreciate all of your questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Please stay closer to the microphone.

MRS. NEMETH: Oh, sorry. I guess what is the risk, to just make sure we're addressing your question of what like the concern is to. I know it goes above the impervious surface, but like in terms of, to make sure that we're addressing like your concerns, too, I just want to make sure I understand.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, I think we're both probably saying the same thing. I mean, we exist to evaluate all these exceptions on a case-by-case basis. So, again, I'll speak for myself, I'll let the Board members speak for themselves, when I heard about your story and why you wanted this project, like I said, the height one, I have no issue. I can't speak for them; I have no issue. You want to put in another bedroom and bathroom, I got it.

But you are asking for, in my opinion, a significant increase to your impervious surface area coverage and a not insignificant decrease to your front yard setback. So, I'm trying to understand (a) your hardship and (b) if you can get by with, if what you are asking is the minimum amount of space that you think you need. That's why I also asked in the beginning the question about the project, are these two elements of your project mutually exclusive or are they dependent upon one another? Because the bedroom/bathroom upstairs, I have no issue with. I don't know what the others have to say.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I have similar views. I have no qualms with the bedroom and bathroom upstairs, but your front porch is going to be, according to the dimensions, I'm on the proper sheet now, 34 feet 2.5 inches in length, or width, excuse me, and in depth is eight feet.

MR. COATH: To the outside.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, to the outside. That's a good-sized porch, and that's why it's bumping you up so high on the percentage.

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, this is the time, so what the Chairman was also saying is we have, when we've been faced with multiple variances, partitioned the vote off to vote on a portion of those variances and see how the chips fall, okay. Now, remember, if you lose, if you get a no vote on a variance, there's a preclusive effect of one year, okay. So, and the other thing is

that people will basically say, all right, I'll scale back my design to gain support and get a yes, right, because you don't want the preclusive effect, right, because that would put you back another year, right. You probably want this because you have a family, you said you have two kids in there, right?

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And your kids are growing. So, this is the spot or I think we have to ask the architect, is it feasible, for example, to scale down the front porch of that and still keep the overall positive aesthetic appearance and the curb appeal there, and then is it viable then for your clients, the Petitioners, right? Do you understand where I'm going with this? Okay, so this is where you answer.

MR. COATH: I guess I have a question first. You're concerned about the impervious. I think we could address impervious by going after some mitigation in the current pavers, you know, with the solid surface out there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That would probably, yes, that was going to be my questions as well.

MR. COATH: I think the best way, you know, because ideally, this I think has the greatest payback is this investment on the front porch and all.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, how would you do what you suggested?

MR. COATH: I would look at reducing as much of your impervious surface over the property in order to bring that ask down.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Is that a patio to the back?

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

MR. NEMETH: So, they're like, what, 2.5 by 4-inch blocks, so that whole is a small --

MR. COATH: That whole area is, it tapers.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, doing that on the fly now versus moving to suspend, right, that's one of your options. So, you've got a couple of options as Petitioners, right. You can try and push forward, but you could probably tell, you roll the dice, right? You could move to suspend, right, and then adjust your petition, work with the Village and rerun the calculation, and you come back in front of us and you can come back as fast as you can come back, you don't wait a year, okay. So, choose wisely.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I have a comment. I understand where the other Board members are coming from and I, for the most part, agree with them. But then I'm looking at the Staff comments here, especially Engineering, and they don't share those same comments. We're always, on this Board --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Deferential.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: -- very, very sensitive to impervious issues, and yet our Engineering Department and the other departments as well didn't weigh in on that. So, I'm not quite in that boat; I'm leaning that way.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Jeff, share that number, please.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. So, just calculating from what I heard from Staff, you're roughly 58 percent coverage today which is eight percent over what is allowed.

MR. NEMETH: Yes, correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Going to 65 percent is 438 feet, yes 438 feet ballpark.

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, the question is can you (a) pull 438-foot of impervious out, or get a lot closer to that number, you know? As you've probably heard tonight, existing conditions are something we look favorably on. We don't tend to make people correct existing problems, right?

MR. NEMETH: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Going up and beyond that is a much tougher ask.

MR. NEMETH: Yes, so you're, sorry to interrupt, but the question from me would be the increase from 58 to 65 roughly is a total of 400 something?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And 38 feet if I did the math right.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That's a healthy number; that's a big number.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, again, something to think about. I guess I'll stop there.

MR. NEMETH: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, you understand your options right now, right?

MR. NEMETH: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, so what are you thinking?

MRS. NEMETH: I mean, I guess, I think that, I'm talking aloud for a minute, I think the eight feet, too, is like having to make it a functional porch versus like it's just hanging out there to hang out there in front of the house. We want to make it functional, right? So, what does that look like and do you pull out something in the back to --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Can you find 200 feet in the backyard of impervious and change it?

MR. COATH: That whole sidewalk down the --

MR. NEMETH: All of the south side, I've been planning to rip that all out, yes.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes, on the --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, if you're taking that out anyway, that calculation makes it closer --

MR. NEMETH: Closer.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right? So, then there are some other things you can do, yes, it helps.

MR. NEMETH: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Can you do what you just suggested at the same time this project is underway?

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Is there any drainage issues right now as it sits?

MR. NEMETH: To my knowledge, no.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: No neighbor complaints about drainage into their yards, no puddling in your front yard or on the side there?

MR. NEMETH: No.

MRS. NEMETH: No, not in our front yard.

MR. NEMETH: No, no.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, that's kind of like --

MR. NEMETH: 812 is roughly the bottom of the hill that's on the south side, yes.

MRS. NEMETH: South side, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Well, we don't have any neighbor opposition, right? The neighbors haven't submitted anything? Okay, so that kind --

MRS. NEMETH: We've got a neighbor here, too.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, why don't you have a seat and if this gentleman wants to make a comment, you can, and then you'll have the opportunity to respond to that. Then we'll close it down for deliberation.

MRS. NEMETH: Thank you for the conversation.

MR. NEMETH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: A brief comment, or --

MR. HILL: My comments are brief.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: -- going to be.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, we don't have to swear you in. You just need to state your name.

MR. HILL: Douglas Hill.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Go ahead.

MR. HILL: Address or no? All right, so 824 North Dunton. So, I am just one house, well, I'm right next door. So, in regards to, you know, what is being proposed and what is being offered, the idea of the porch we feel is fantastic as far as my wife and I and the surrounding neighbors. It obviously draws upon to what Arlington Heights and the community is trying to do, right, as we're trying to get neighbors out in front of their house. We're trying to get neighbors to communicate with one another rather than forcing them to the backyard. So, obviously, having a porch would be a wonderful addition to that idea and to that premise.

Now, the other thing is, as they mentioned, they have two young kids. It gives them the comfort to be out front, right, because Dunton is a rather dangerous street in some respects. Unfortunately, we do have a lot of people that speed up and down. Dual use as far as people walking by, there's a lot of neighbors that walk by with their dogs, we have the parade. So, in that respect, I think it's fantastic.

I will speak to, you know, architecturally I don't know if I'm allowed to or not, but you know, any reduction I think will alter as far as the front facade of the house. Pulling it back, right, is going to create some structural changes that they're going to have to make, and I don't know what that does to the design or sight lines or things of that nature, or if it has any bearing on any of the internal space or the second story, right?

As far as the height, we have no issues with the height. You

know, it's a half foot, it's not really a big deal.

Then, impervious surface, I don't really know how you guys figure it out, but if they're putting deck boards and you have gravel and dirt underneath it, I assume that drainage would be adequate and they could probably do additional things with drainage. But we're definitely in agreeance with it.

To your point earlier, to the south side, there is a sidewalk that, well, it's not really a sidewalk. It's like a half sidewalk, but there is concrete there that I don't know that the neighbors necessarily use it because of its function. The neighbor to the south of them, two owners previous had them cut that sidewalk in half because it bled into their property line, but obviously that would help from a square footage standpoint of the impervious surface. The patio existed there when they bought the property, and that is where, you know, they have the pavers in the backyard and whatnot.

So, I would hate to see the design change, to minimize the front porch, because I do think that it does add to the appeal of the neighborhood. Also, if you go two blocks south, if you go south each block down, you'll notice that those neighbors' front porches and front stairs do encroach further and further towards the sidewalk. So, it's kind of like our block seems to be the ones that are more restrictive than what some of the previous neighbors are. There is one house that's under construction now that's a house in from Euclid that is significantly close to the sidewalk with a massive front porch.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you. I was going to invoke the three minutes, but I was going to let you finish. So, thank you for your comments.

MR. HALL: Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: It's okay.

MR. HALL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You have the opportunity to respond to that; otherwise, you don't have to.

MRS. NEMETH: No, Doug was great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, so we're going to close it down for --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Wait, wait.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do we make a counter or do we -- all right, so before we close this down for deliberation, I sense that we were getting to a point for the porch, we were going to potentially broker a deal with the property owner about work that they can do in parallel with the project that would mitigate the 438 additional square feet of impervious surface area coverage.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Or they move to suspend to do that, not in this setting, but do it carefully, working together and then they come back to the Village and then they'll re-notice for the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Dan, how quickly could they come back in if they wanted to get a continuance?

MR. OSOBA: They theoretically could come back in for the May meeting if they turn around documents fast enough, but if you make a motion to continue it, you can make a motion to continue it to a date certain. If you do that, they do not have to re-notice the public hearing. If it is a continuance and it's left

open-ended, then they would have to re-notice. That's the only difference.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, do you understand that? Understand that little stipulation?

MR. NEMETH: One more time?

MRS. NEMETH: That we could come back in May with the adjustment. But I guess I want to clarify, like if we say we will commit to revamp the weird half sidewalk on the side of the house, we wanted to do that anyway, coupled with whatever back porch we need to be able to make the front porch, like do we have to formalize that, or is this formalizing that?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We could make it contingent if they commit to doing a certain activity, right?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, we don't want to get, I think we want to get embroiled in that right now. Let them talk amongst themselves and with their architect. The key issue is, okay, if we suspend, if you move to suspend and agree to reappear in the May meeting, whenever that date is, you should check your calendars, okay, then you don't have to re-notice.

MR. NEMETH: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: If we don't identify a particular date you are going to reappear, then you will have to re-notice, which is a pain. So, Dan is going to tell you when the May meeting is. You should check your calendar and make sure you're available on that meeting.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, the advantage in my mind -- go ahead, Dan.

MR. OSOBA: It's just May 11th is the next Zoning Board meeting.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: May 11th. So, the advantage in my mind to continuing this for you guys, it would be you could sit down with your architect in a thoughtful way, kind of figure out how do we get what we want while maintaining the important elements of the design, right? If we do it on the fly here, we won't think about something, you know, it's always a loss of unintended consequences.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You may make a mistake.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. So, I would feel better if you guys take a little bit of time, especially knowing that we can continue it to a date specific where it's not going to do, I know it's going to postpone you for a month. So, yes, I realize that is a hassle but I think continuing for a month might be better than the outcome you would receive tonight.

MRS. NEMETH: And just clarifying to say that we need to evidence that we're decreasing the impervious surface, what we proposed today, by doing X, Y and Z?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, my suggestion would be have the numbers of what you have today where you can pull them up easily and say, okay, today we're at 58 percent, it's, making up numbers here, 4,300 feet, and we're going to 4,700 feet, but we're taking out this much concrete, and at the end of the day we're going to 4,400 feet. I'm making up numbers here.

MRS. NEMETH: Okay. Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: 438 is your number.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You want to pull out 438. Well, again, I'd like to know what their, I'm basing it on the 58 percent that Staff said they got already. So, I'd like to know, try to keep it to where you're at today or really close to where you're at today, and I think you'll receive a much more favorable outcome.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: You'll know what the cost impact is, you'll know what it's going to do with the timing of your project, rather than trying to figure it out now.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That's the way to do it.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I'm in complete agreement on a continuance. It's your call.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes, I think we can come back in May.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, how do we memorialize this?

MR. OSOBA: It would be, someone would need to make a motion to continue this and that motion may include that the petition be continued to May 11th, or continued to an undisclosed date in which they would have to re-notice. So, it would be up to them.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Do you think you'd be ready in a month is the question.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, again, I don't want to put a date specific in here and, you know, it's like oh, my gosh, I'm on vacation in three weeks.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, you're okay with a continuance?

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: To May 11th?

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: All right, because then you won't have to re-notice.

MR. NEMETH: Yes.

MRS. NEMETH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: All right, because the Chairman can't make a motion, all right, I'll move for a continuance of this petition, ZBA #26-005, to May 11th, in its entirety, the petition in its entirety.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: 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: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

MRS. NEMETH: Thank you.

MR. NEMETH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: We look forward to seeing you next
month.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 2504 EAST GREGORY STREET - ZBA #26-006

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 13th day of April, 2026 at the hour of
8:15 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Let the record state that Board Member Siavelis had to leave for the evening.

All right, Agenda Item E, if I can find my agenda. Agenda Item E, ZBA #26-006, 2504 East Gregory Street.

MR. POLLEY: My name is Matt Polley. I am the owner of 2504 East Gregory Street, along with my wife.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, Staff report.

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 One-Family Dwelling District, and the Petitioner is proposing to construct a porch in the front of the main entrance of their house which is in the exterior side yard. This proposed addition is set back 20.13 feet from the exterior side lot line where the required minimum setback is 26.23 feet.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 6.1-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(c) to allow an addition that is set back 20.13 feet from the exterior side lot line where the required minimum setback is 26.23 feet.

Thank you.

MR. POLLEY: All right, yes, we bought this house back in 2013. We love the town of Arlington Heights, kids at Prospect south. You know, we really want to stay here. It's been kind of the vision of ours to update our house to make it what we want. Outdoor space was going to be really important to us. We want to be able to talk to our neighbors, hang outside a lot more. We actually live on a corner, on Gregory and Evanston, specifically it's right across the street from Meadows Park. So, we really have, you know, our neighbor to our one side and another and behind us, but nothing really across the street from us. Usually, if we're going to talk to people, it's people coming around, walking their dogs, kind of just doing it more socially that way.

So, you know, we really want to have an important space to be able to like hang out and see our neighbors. So, a front porch was really kind of like one of the main reasons we were going to be doing an addition along with updating our kitchen. So, I mean, that was really kind of one of our big intentions. Obviously, when we put it on our plans, we thought we had to have a variance for this.

So, putting in a front porch, the setback is pretty much set on our house right now, and then the neighbor to our side just because there's only two houses on the end of the street. Both our setbacks are pretty much the same. So, any porch you put on is going to require a variance. So, I think it's just relatively simple.

Now, in terms of our design, I don't know if we can show the front of the house? Yes, there. We really, oh, no, that's the old version. The new is right there.

So, it's really important to us when we're doing our design, we didn't really want to affect the way the house looks. We want to keep it as similar to what exists today. So, you know, really kind of going for the minimum look but still be able to have a functional front porch. So, you know, the way we were trying to

make it is just a central piece for our front yard. We really want to make it symmetric across the front face, I think we even got some pretty positive feedback from the Design Commission in terms of how this fits in with the existing house design.

You know, to get it to work, you know, getting a small porch first off over the door wouldn't be really functional, to actually get a front porch in to the end. Then, the minimum, you know, length or I guess width of the porch to frame the front door and the front window was pretty much what we tried to show, so we really, really kind of stuck to that.

In terms of the depth of the front porch, you know, all the research and talking to our architect, a functional front porch from the discussion with him was somewhere around six to eight feet. So, you know, we decided we really just want the minimum, so we went with six feet for this particular design. All right, so it makes sense.

In terms of just not really impacting any of the neighbors, you know, I don't have any neighbors across the street. So, I mean, the only people I'm going to be able to affect are the people playing soccer across the street. From the side to side, it's not really going to be something that our neighbors to the side are going to see. Since we're on a corner, in terms of traffic visibility, we're not really extending it out too much, you know, kind of like the sight lines, it's really not even going into like a triangle feature, it's not even going to affect anybody being able to see along Evanston or Gregory Street.

All right, let me make sure I'm getting everything. In terms of like positive impacts, I really think that this is going to help, you know, make our house, you know, our home value much better, hopefully increase taxes for the Village. I think it will help to make our neighborhood look nice. You know, I think, we're right by a park, people drive by our house a lot, so I think it will help the image of the neighborhood.

I guess another thing, too, since we live on Gregory Street, I don't know if you're aware, there's like a pool over by Culver's, like if you drive down there or walk the dogs, you know, I think for us, this is an increase in privacy for our house. So, it's another thing that we really would be looking forward to.

I think, I mean, I think those were all the points. So, I think that's it.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Thank you. I don't have too many questions, just confirming, no negative neighbor feedback?

MR. POLLEY: Oh, I talked to probably like seven or eight different neighbors. I mean, everybody was pretty positive on it. I think we've been talking about doing this project for the last eight years. So, I mean, they have all kind of heard of it.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: You guys are long-time homeowners?

MR. POLLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: You said 13 or 12 years?

MR. POLLEY: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And you spoke with your architect, he

said six to eight feet in terms of depth would be good, and you guys are at six feet in depth.

MR. POLLEY: Yes. So, I mean, basically, we wanted to be able to have chairs out there, sit out and, you know, be able to hang out with us and be able to see our neighbors as they're walking by. A lot of people walk dogs by our house, and we have two of them.

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

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: What are your dogs' names?

MR. POLLEY: Copper and Dahlia.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Copper and Dahlia? Nice.

MR. POLLEY: Yes. I think our daughter named the one Dahlia, and our other one looks like a copper coin, so pretty easy.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I have one for Staff actually. Darko, is part of the reason for this variance because it's a side yard that's --

MR. BOJIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, if it was on the front yard it probably would not have an issue whatsoever. Yes. I live in a corner side yard also and it's challenging. I understand some of the issues with that.

MR. POLLEY: I didn't even touch the impervious square footage, but our lot is pretty big so we're way under.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You're good in that respect, okay.

MR. POLLEY: So, you know our points.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I do.

MR. POLLEY: It's a really good training exercise for my sons to mow lawn.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'm sure.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

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

MR. POLLEY: Thank you.

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

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, close it down for Board deliberation. Frank, you want to take this?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, this is a reasonable ask. Great presentation, very organized. We know the unique circumstance of a corner lot, and I appreciate taking the advice of the architect to take the minimum depth required. So, this is a pretty easy one for me, I'm supportive of this variance.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Agree.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Agree.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I move to approve this variance as

presented.

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: Mr. Siavelis.

(No response.)

MR. BOJIN: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Congratulations.

MR. POLLEY: Thank you, guys.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Thanks for sitting through the evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, we have other business which is ZBA Public Comment Procedures.

MR. OSOBA: I can go over briefly this item that was included in the packet. This is something we're doing for all of our boards and commissions that the Planning Department manages in coordination with our Attorney's Office to kind of put together a memo and more or less standardize what our procedures are for public comment. This is related mostly to the public comment that would be the general public comment at any public hearing, not on a, you know, specific case.

So, I think the summary of the recommendations and kind of what was included in the report is to provide, to make sure that we provide public comment at all of these board meetings, which we do; set a time limit, I know in our procedures we currently have a time limit, this would essentially memorialize that into an actual procedure that is adopted by the Board; and then some kind of guidance from our Legal Department as a general rule, refraining from responding or debating with the public during that general public comment period; and then adopting these rules for public comment.

So, for this item, if there's any deliberation between the Zoning Board, you can do that, and then ultimately it would be a motion and then a roll call vote.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: On the three minutes, if this gets memorialized and standardized, is there going to be like an actual timer, or it's left to the Chair to play on my phone and see how much time has elapsed?

MR. OSOBA: Typically, I think we're doing the Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so basically I'm the timekeeper.

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Or you can probably pass it off to

somebody.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I know we're not going to give it to the one who sits over here, right?

Any other thoughts or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, is it a voice vote or how do we do this?

MR. OSOBA: Let's do a roll call vote.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, is there a motion to adopt these new procedures?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Move to adopt these procedures as presented.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 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.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: We didn't really have a choice, right? Okay, fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there anybody, so is that agenda item done then?

MR. OSOBA: That is, that's all of it, yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, is there anybody present who wishes to make any public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNOR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We're off.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:26 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