

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 620 NORTH HIGHLAND AVENUE - ZBA #26-011

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
NOAH ARCE, Intern

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: We're going to call the June Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order.

Can we have a roll call, please?

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Here.

Okay, would you all please join me in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance? 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 last month's meeting.

Has everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes? If so, are there any edits or changes needed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, none.

Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, next, we'll go over the hearing procedures. This just helps the audience understand how the meeting will be run.

So, first, quorum. 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, as you can see tonight, we have seven. So, you will need four affirmative votes to receive approval on your variance or variances.

Regarding the variation hardship, we're going to need you to explain the four elements necessary to establish order for the Board to be able to grant a variation. Those four elements are:

1. That the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property;

2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned;
3. That the proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter; and
4. That the variation requested is the minimum variation necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

A variation shall be permitted only if the evidence, in the judgment of the Board of Appeals, sustains each of the four conditions enumerated. To just reinforce, look, we've had a chance to review all your packets, but the expectation is that when you come up to the podium, you help us understand why you're asking for the variance. Think of this as an exception. So, help us understand the logic and the justification on why you are seeking this exception.

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

Public comment. Members of the public may speak on the application. Speakers must be sworn under oath and state and spell their name clearly.

Do we have any registered objectors?

MR. OSOBA: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so any person who is not formally registered as an objector may speak at the hearing but must limit their comments to three minutes. The Chair may, in his discretion, alter the maximum time provided to public commenters provided the maximum time is applied to all speakers.

So, if you can review the agenda up there, all I'm asking is if you are a member of the public, if you wish to comment, you can comment on that particular variance. As you can see, there is an agenda item at the very end, Open Public Comment. That is open to whatever matter you want to speak to publicly. If you're going to speak to a variance, my ask is that you are speaking to that specific variance.

The applicant will then make a closing statement and present any follow-up testimony or evidence. The applicant will then rest their case. The Board will make a motion to close public testimony. The Board 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, with that, there is no old business, so let's get right to new business. Agenda Item A, 620 North Highland Avenue, ZBA Case #26-011.

MR. BABICZ: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Good evening. Have you both signed in?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

MR. BABICZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so could you each state your name and address for the record?

MR. SCHNEIDER: One at a time?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, please.

MR. SCHNEIDER: All right. Jason Schneider, I'm at 620 North Highland here in Arlington Heights.

MR. BABICZ: I'm Damian Babicz, architect of record, 1302 South 5th Avenue, Des Plaines, Illinois 60018.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Go ahead.

MR. OSOBA: The property is zoned R-3 and has a total land area of approximately 10,500 square feet. The Petitioner is proposing to replace their existing garage with a new one. The proposed garage is larger than code permits and encroaches into the required rear yard setback.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variations:

- A 2.24-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to allow a detached garage that is set back 2.76 feet from the rear property line where the required setback is five feet, plus an additional one foot for the eave; and
- A six-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-7 to allow a detached garage 726 square feet in area, where the maximum allowed by code is 720 square feet.

MR. BABICZ: Just to clarify, what you see on the top in the rendering, it's very similar to the existing garage. It only has a roofed patio right next to it. So, the first variation that we're seeking is to match the setback of the rear, to match the existing. So, the existing garage is 28 x 21. We're actually reducing the size of the garage to 25 x 20, which is 500 square feet. The roofed area for the patio, the original is 15 x 12, and we are proposing the same width of 12 feet but a little longer by 19 feet to meet with the flagstone that's not damaged.

The reason for the variation not to be five feet off the rear is due to how close the garage is located to the existing wood deck. Between the garage and the deck, there's approximately 18 feet, and the actual driveway is 16 feet. We are pushing the garage to the north as much as we can to three feet setback. We're offsetting the door as you can see on the rendering all the way to the north to allow easier getting in and out of the garage.

The second variation that we're seeking for that six square feet is just to meet with the existing flagstone. The actual roofed area is basically, it's all freestanding structure and four posts. It's not attached to the garage, versus the existing is right now attached. It's in very bad condition, beyond saving it and repairing it. So, that's why we're trying to create a safe space for the homeowner.

The exterior of the garage is going to match the house. The house has been recently renovated with a new siding. So, all the elements are being matched to the house to create a more cohesive lot.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You got this one?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I do.

A couple of quick questions. How many people live in the

house?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Five.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: How long have you been there?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We've been there since November 2020.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, so you've been there a little while. You've done a nice job updating the house. If I understood correctly, the garage is actually shrinking in size?

MR. SCHNEIDER: It's getting slightly smaller, correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is that correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, but I did also hear that the roofed portion was going to grow a little bit; is that correct?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is that roofed portion also in the rear yard setback or is it only the garage that's encroaching?

MR. BABICZ: Only the garage is encroaching.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: All right, thank you. So, you have two variances that's the rear yard setback and then the six-foot variation. Got it, but in essence, you're taking an existing non-conforming use and actually making it slightly better by shrinking the footprint of the garage.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it.

MR. SCHNEIDER: We're shrinking it. The condition of the garage is what's driving the replacement, and the location of the garage and where we're shifting it to the north as far as we can and the location of the doors to make it more functional. Right now it's not functional. We get one car in and that's it. We can't get both cars in because the deck is in the way.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Any feedback from the neighbors?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Everybody has had positive feedback on it, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No negative feedback has been received?

MR. SCHNEIDER: I have not received any negative feedback.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How many cars do you own?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Two.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And the existing garage is roughly three foot off the property line?

MR. SCHNEIDER: It's, sorry, it's going right back where it is right now. So, I think you've got the actual notes, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BABICZ: Yes, so on the west --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Oh, yes, yes.

MR. BABICZ: -- side, it's 2.76; we're matching it. On the north side, right now it's 3.82, we're going to three feet to push the garage door as far --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So that you can access it a little bit better, yes.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, I have no further questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Are there any other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat. We'll see if anybody wishes to comment publicly.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

Is there anybody present who would like to comment on this request for a variance?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so with that said, we'll turn it down for Board deliberation. Jeff, do you want to start?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, this one seems pretty straightforward to me. I mean, as I mentioned, the garage is already an existing non-conforming setup. They're actually shrinking the size of it a little bit. They're pushing a little bit to the north 0.8 feet to allow better access, but I think considering that it's already an existing non-conforming; I don't have an issue with this and I can support it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, I concur. Same reasons.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I move to approve as presented.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: I second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 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.

Congratulations.

MR. BABICZ: Thank you.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

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

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 400 EAST PARK AVENUE - ZBA #26-012

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of June, 2026 at the hour of
7:11 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
NOAH ARCE, Intern

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Let's move on to Agenda Item B, 400 East Park Avenue, ZBA Case #26-012.

So, how do we want to do this?

MR. HAMMAN: We have submitted photos of that.

MR. ECKHARDT: We submitted photos of them.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, so this is for us then.

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes, right.

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

MR. HAMMAN: Mike Hamman, 422 South Vail Avenue, Arlington Heights.

MR. ECKHARDT: I'm Ted Eckhardt. I'm the homeowner and the architect of record.

(Witnesses sworn.)

MR. ECKHARDT: Okay, what I'm going to do quick --

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: We're going to have Staff presentation first, sir.

MR. ECKHARDT: Oh, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, sir. He'll go first.

Thanks, Frank.

MR. OSOBA: The property is zoned R-3 and has a total land area of approximately 10,345 square feet. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a new detached garage at the southwestern portion of the property adjacent to the existing driveway. The proposed garage encroaches into the required exterior side yard.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 14.09-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-3 to allow a detached garage that is set back 12.06 feet from the exterior side lot line where the required minimum setback is 26.15 feet, plus an additional one foot for the eave.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Go ahead.

MR. ECKHARDT: Okay, what I'd like to do to get the four important questions into the record is quickly answer those questions so we can get that done.

I hereby state that the proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of the nearby property if granted the variance. The existing home was built around 1946. It's a corner lot, initially, on a 50 x 131 lot. Sometime during the ownership of this property, a full lot was divided between Mr. Kubow's property who is sitting right there and the property that I purchased. So, there's a 25-foot x 150-foot strip that runs along north-south on the east side. It has a single PIN number.

One unique aspect of this L-shaped 25 x 150-foot portion is not apparent from the Park Street, reference the survey. The hardship with the existing house is based upon a few existing conditions. The existing attached garage is not big enough to park two cars. The 14 foot-wide door will allow an SUV and a small car to get in, but you can't open the door once you're inside the garage.

As an architect, you would have thought I could have figured that out before I bought the house, but my house, I moved 60 feet from Mayfair to Park. I had a 14-foot door on that house. I figured, okay, this is going to work. Well, the inside of the garage is about 4.5 feet narrower, but it sort of wasn't apparent to me. Well, at any rate, it won't work, so this past winter, my wife got the warm garage and I parked in the snow. So, that's why I'm here.

The width of the garage is too narrow. We just moved into the home, having lived across the street for 42 years. The solution is to build a detached garage that has been designed to be compatible with the existing home and the neighborhood, as many homes in Scarsdale have detached garages.

The existing home is non-compliant for a corner lot. The home sits 11.42 feet and 12.06 feet from Park Street. The home across the street sits actually on the lot line that's owned by Pete Parry. These homes are sited well and well balanced, and adding a garage will fit in.

The purpose of building this little model is to sort of exhibit that, how it fits in away from Jon's house in the front, and there's good separation here. Actually, Jon's got a basketball hoop right there, so I think it fits in okay. One of the things is that, and I didn't glue the house on because one question will be, well, Ted, how come you didn't just push it back? Well, if I push it back, what happens is it puts a cork in the back of the land, I can't get to it. So, I met with Steve Hautzinger and we went over it. He eventually agreed that, yes, that is probably the best solution at that location, okay?

These homes are well sited and feel balanced. Careful study of the location of the detached garage has determined it is located in the only feasible footprint. This request will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with the existing use, all R-3 lots that are mostly 50 foot-wide which causes hardships with planning any additions. The new detached garage, where located, is being placed on an existing paved area where we parked a car previously and the owners parked as well. So, it has been used as a parking space for a very long time, therefore, not altering the use of this lot. Please refer to the plat of survey to see that portion.

The design of the new garage has been purposely positioned to mimic the existing elevation of the main house with two identical windows, garage doors facing each other to avoid a garage door facing Park Street. That was one of my main issues of design. I don't like garage doors facing the street, so I turned the garage so it would face the other garage. Then this garage here, this is the garage here, these two windows will be exactly the same size, so this is mimicking that which I think is a very nice element for me.

The location of the garage will not crowd the house to the east as there is a driveway there, reference the site model where the east home has been included.

The next question, I hereby state 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. The previous owner of the house moved out seven years ago. The house has been vacant. Although he maintained the exterior of the home, everything inside came apart. No plumbing, no heat, it was a

complete wreck, but that didn't scare me too much. My wife, she got scared but I didn't. She proved out to be mostly right, but we got it done. We moved in in December.

The property has been zoned R-3 for as long as I know.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: This is past December? 2025?

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes, I just moved in.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay.

MR. ECKHARDT: You know, I was remodeling the interior all this time. We're just finishing the landscaping now.

The Takkit-built home did not provide an adequate sized garage from the start. My wife Melinda and I have been parking two cars in the garage on Mayfair for 40 years. As expected, her car goes in and mine goes out.

The last point, or two more points. I hereby state that the proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and the intent of Chapter 28. This request is a valid candidate for the variation as it fits into an existing setback along Park Street and will provide safe parking for a second car and storage of stools, bikes and more. My wife and I are seniors and we need a little more room to park cars.

I hereby state that the variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property. A careful analysis of the location of the garage is the minimum required for a two-car garage or one-car with room for storage. We only have two cars. The site already has been paved, a paved drive where the garage is being planned, and the area of the garage is modest.

That concludes my presentation.

Do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Is it just you and your wife in the home?

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And you have two cars?

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, and you plan on using both garages? One car per garage?

MR. ECKHARDT: I'm going to park in the one out and she's going to park in the attached garage.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Your neighbors are, you've talked to the neighbors?

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes. The three neighbors, actually Jon might want to, since he came here, maybe he'll say something. But Peter Parry signed a letter; he's right across the street. Then the Muellers are my neighbors behind me, I went over everything with them, they had no problem with it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, as thorough as Ted's, the Petitioner's presentation is, and it is quite thorough, you didn't touch on a point that I think works in your favor. Street side, southern edge of the proposed garage, you have a lot of foliage, mature plants and bushes and shrubs.

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That garage, that new garage is going to go up and it's going to be obstructed.

MR. ECKHARDT: That foliage that's blocking my view down Park, it's going bye-bye.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: This, the one that's --

MR. ECKHARDT: Yes, I had to put the landscaping in on the east side because I'm waiting to see if this gets approved. John Fitzgerald did the plan for me and I have, I got to get it done so I can see. But my intention is I'm going to pull in and then back into the garage so when I come out I can see cars coming from the east, and they're coming pretty good.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: But that foliage doesn't go all the way to the curb, does it? There's so many.

MR. ECKHARDT: Well, I have to meet with Jon to see what he wants to do. Some of it is on his property, but it's overgrown.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, it's overgrown. I guess my point is like when I walked it this past weekend and I stopped to say hello to you, you can't really see that spot too well --

MR. ECKHARDT: No.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: -- from the street. So, it's not like you're going to put an eyesore there --

MR. ECKHARDT: No.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: -- and if your neighbors directly to your east are in support of this, they're the ones who would be most affected if at all.

MR. ECKHARDT: Right. Correct. There's a large arborvitae there, Peter, and they're going to stay, and whatever Jon wants.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, so that was my point. That's it.

MR. ECKHARDT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: It's not like you're going to have a large white elephant sticking out on the side of the lot.

MR. ECKHARDT: No, no. Same color scheme, greys, black door, black windows, the same as the house. So, it will all be happily --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Integrated.

MR. ECKHARDT: Integrated.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And just for my clarification, Park Street is actually your side yard even though everything seems to face --

MR. ECKHARDT: Correct, the front yard is over on Belmont.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, your house is also 12-foot off the setback.

MR. ECKHARDT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, it's a non-conforming --

MR. ECKHARDT: I'm matching that wall exactly --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right.

MR. ECKHARDT: -- and that was the intent.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That was, which was kind of my

point. You have a non-conforming location to your house.

MR. ECKHARDT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You're matching it to visually be more appealing which, you know, I understand that.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you may have a seat.

Is there anybody present who wishes to comment on this variance? We just need his name, no address?

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, can you say your name for the record?

MR. KUBOW: Jonathan Kubow, 416 East Park. So, I'm the neighbor at hand. I live directly adjacent east to the Eckhardts.

MR. ECKHARDT: That's Jon's house on the --

MR. KUBOW: That's my house. I've been a resident of Arlington Heights for 14 years now and I've been on the Design Commission for about 12 years. So, I think I'm uniquely backed to be able to speak on this matter this evening, but I'm obviously very supportive.

As you mentioned, we're the most impacted by the Petitioner this evening and I can't wait to see this go up. I think what they've already done with the existing house has been miraculous, the renovation. I think this is going to be a great addition. It provides a little bit more buffer between us, and as he mentioned before, we already have arbors, we have a ton of foliage, so most people wouldn't even notice this. Well, we will and we're very supportive of it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

Do you wish to rebut?

MR. ECKHARDT: No, I wish to thank Jon for showing up here.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right, anybody else present who wishes to speak on this variance?

(No response.)

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

Frank, do you want to start us off?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes. Yes, this is a pretty interesting case with the two parcels on the lot and the shape, the already non-conforming existing use of the home. The hardship has been demonstrated by the Petitioner. We have three neighbor letters here, one of which came in and spoke to us today, so we appreciate that.

This isn't a variance for the size of the garage or, you know, a variance for the overage of the accessory structure. It's just kind of matching the already non-conforming use, and I would be in favor of this petition for the presentation that Mr. Eckhardt presented to us here.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, so I'll just, I agree with you. As somebody who's walked by this house probably 300 times a year for the last 20 years, I think what the Eckhardts have done is much needed and I understand

exactly what they're talking about as far as being able to open the garage, or the car doors in the garage. I didn't get it at first when I first saw the papers, and then I went there and had a little site inspection, went in the garage and I could see exactly what Mr. Eckhardt was referring to.

So, the demand or the need is certainly justifiable and legitimate, and he's fortunate that he has that parcel to the side and he's got a neighbor who's willing to not raise an objection for him because this is different but it's certainly within the realm of a variance in the elements. So, I'm supportive of it as well.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: I think he's made a great case; I'm in favor of it. I wish everyone came in with a board like that. It would make it a lot easier. Good job, great job.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: He's got a lot of time on his hands.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: That took a couple of minutes, I'm sure.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I move to approve as presented.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll second.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 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.

Congratulations.

MR. ECKHARDT: Thank you, guys. Have a good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Congrats.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:27 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 221 SOUTH CHESTNUT AVENUE - ZBA #26-013

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Zoning Board of Appeals taken at the Arlington Heights
Village Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor, Buechner Room,
Arlington Heights, Illinois on the 9th day of June, 2026 at the hour of
7:27 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
NOAH ARCE, Intern

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Agenda Item C, 221 South Chestnut Avenue, ZBA #26-013.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You're dressed up today.

MR. PURDOM: Yes. I'm Kevin Purdom with JRC Design Build.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Address?

MR. PURDOM: Address, 1275 East Davis Street, Arlington Heights.
(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Staff report.

MS. NADEEM: The property is zoned R-3 and has a total land area of approximately 6,990 square feet. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a porch in the front yard and a second-story addition. The second-story addition and other exterior modifications has received administrative Design Commission approval. This proposed porch addition is set back 23.83 feet from the front lot line.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 1.97-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-3.3(a), *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow an addition that is set back 23.83 feet from the front lot line where the required minimum setback is 25.80 feet.

MR. PURDOM: All right, so I am here representing my client, Jim Busby and his wife. They bought the house in 2008 and it's just those two people living in the house. They've heard nothing but positive feedback. They haven't heard any negative feedback.

They are adding a second-story addition with whole new bedrooms, remodeling the first floor, and adding a covered front porch to the house. The permit has actually been approved with a three-foot front porch that goes across the front of the house. They did that in order to get the full access and just have some chairs out there to sit. But we all went back to the drawing board and decided after it was all approved that we wanted to extend that two feet past the front of the house which is where we're asking to encroach in the front yard setback.

So, we're actually allowed to do a five by 10 porch into the setback, but because the left side of the house is 19.5 feet, we're asking for this variance to go that extra to carry all the way across. Like I said, it's already been approved, design review and the permit, we're just asking to extend that out and extend the roof line out. If we were to do it with the allowed 10 by five, it would impact that roof line, and it actually looks a lot better when it goes all the way across instead of stops 10 feet and then goes back for the last nine feet. We're not asking any more than just a basic five-foot patio for chairs, to walk to and sit on the front covered patio.

It's in harmony with the spirit of the Chapter because it doesn't impact the rest of the neighborhood. Some other houses are in front; some are behind, it's just the average is what gives us that setback. If the front door was on the garage, we could actually go further in front, but because the front door is actually set back, it doesn't encroach too much into that setback. Like we said, we've had no negative feedback from neighbors, and the Engineering Department and Building Department are in support of it as well.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Kevin, I have a question.

MR. PURDOM: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: The Planning Department knew about the depth to be four feet 10 inches. Your petition says five feet. It's a two-inch difference, but is that a typo or why are they different?

MR. PURDOM: I believe it's five-foot. I think the existing is two-foot-10, so it might have been a typo somewhere in there, but I believe it's five feet to make it a solid number.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Dan, do you know if that's just a typo on the Staff comment?

MR. OSOBA: I believe so, yes. I believe the front porch, to the front post of the front porch is five feet.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, and I wasn't clear, there was some paperwork in there about transfer of the property through a trust. Is the Petitioner the current owner?

MR. PURDOM: I'm the Petitioner but he is the current owner.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Right, yes.

MR. PURDOM: And he lives there.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, and how long has that been?

MR. BUSBY: Since 2008, so 16 years or 15 years.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Okay, I'm good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat. We'll see if anybody wishes to comment.

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

(No response.)

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

Tom, do you want to start us off?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes. I think the three departments we rely on for feedback have given a green light. It's a nice improvement to the property in my view. No neighbor pushback or any problems with neighbors. So, I'm in favor of it. I think they've covered and checked all the boxes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I would agree, and I think you summarized it nicely. Given the circumstances, it's a reasonable request.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Move to approve as presented.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 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. PURDOM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

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

DRAFT

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 719 SOUTH BURTON PLACE - ZBA #26-014

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
NOAH ARCE, Intern

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Next up is Agenda Item D, 719 South Burton Place, ZBA #26-014.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Hi, good evening.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: If you'd both state your name and address for the record, please?

MR. STEFANIDIS: Michael Stefanidis from Natural Innovations Landscaping, 238 South Benton Street, Palatine.

MR. BARNICLE: Kevin Barnicle, 719 South Burton Place.
(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Staff report, please.

MS. NADEEM: The Petitioner is proposing to extend their driveway into a partial "horseshoe" driveway that terminates at the front porch rather than continuing back to Burton Place. The driveway width is proposed at 33.75 feet at the widest point, increasing it from the existing approximate 15 feet wide asphalt driveway. The driveway width will only be expanded to 33.75 feet within 13 feet of the garage to a length of 14.67 feet, then the asphalt would taper to 15 feet.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- An 11.75-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-11.1(b), *Maximum Driveway Width*, to allow a driveway that is 33.75 feet wide where the required maximum width of a driveway is 22 feet.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you.

Go ahead.

MR. STEFANIDIS: So, yes, to address the points being the compatibility with existing uses, we submitted pictures of nearby properties. Obviously, a horseshoe driveway is permitted as long as you're within the 40 percent lot coverage in the front of the property. So, there are many of those in Scarsdale. There's also some that are very similar to this shape. Some of them may have three-car garages, others have two. So, I mean, there's many examples where it's a very similar layout.

As to hardship, the homeowner has an elderly mother. You know, she stays for long periods of time, things like that. It's nice to have a place where she can turn around, park, and can still get in and out while she's there. The lengths of her visits may increase in coming years, things like that. It's also a very long driveway and parking on the street is quite a long walk with the long front yards they have in the neighborhood.

Being in harmony with Chapter 28, so he's under the allowed, I think this proposal would get him up to 31.4 square feet of coverage, impervious surface in the front of the property. He's allowed up to 40. So, he would be able to do a certain width with a horseshoe driveway. To me, this is very similar, it just doesn't terminate on Burton Street. Also, the driveway width at both the street and the garage would be 18 feet; I know that's not exactly how the code is written but it's basically a partial horseshoe driveway as I said.

Then, to me, too, as far as the design perspective goes, this minimizes the amount of impervious surface. If we were to do a horseshoe driveway, you've got a lot more asphalt and things like that in the front yard. So, I think there are some good aesthetic reasons to allow this versus if you want a full

horseshoe driveway, more green space, we're going to do landscaping, other hardscaping and stuff along with the proposal.

As far as the minimum allowed to accomplish the goals here, that's the minimum space to park an average vehicle and be able to turn it around and accomplish what he's trying to do with that space.

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

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I do.

How many folks live in the house?

MR. BARNICLE: Just one.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Just you?

MR. BARNICLE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: How many cars do you have?

MR. BARNICLE: One.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: One, but do you contemplate using that as well as like a turnaround? Although that part of Burton isn't that busy, right? I mean --

MR. BARNICLE: It does go out right to Central so it is a busy street, and it's a narrow street. So, it's not wise to park out in the street, just there's a lot of activity.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, and you spoke with your neighbors, I assume?

MR. BARNICLE: I did send the letters out to everybody, did not receive any response from that. I did speak to five neighbors individually, the ones that live closest to me. They were all, I showed them the pictures and they were all supportive.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No opposition that was provided to you?

MR. BARNICLE: None. None.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, yes, so the Village considers this to be a partial horseshoe; is that accurate, Dan?

MR. STEFANIDIS: I do.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Oh, you do.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Yes. So, I made that up. I coined that phrase.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, where's the rest of the horseshoe?

MR. STEFANIDIS: But, no, so it's not, and you know, it's a parking space. It's not just widening at the garage to 30 feet or, you know, anything like that. It would be, I didn't say partial, they did, I said the start of a horseshoe driveway. So, if you take that, the same idea could be done at the exact same point and then follow it all the way to Burton adding, you know, another 900 square feet of asphalt and other impervious surfaces to the area, then you're allowed to do that, but if you do this, you're not because of the way it's written, I get it. So, that's why we're here.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, so that dimension looks less than 16 feet of length on the branch off from the main drive.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Correct, yes. So, the branch off would be less than that, yes. It's only 14, and that's why I kind of coined the phrase. So, it's not

like he's taking it this wide and he's turning it around, you know.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And you integrate that nicely with the pavers, the stones, right, leading up to the front stoop. So, you have that nice transition there, yes.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Correct, and this was the result of some back and forth between the homeowner and I designing the design. I'd do Zoom calls and I'd get feedback, things like that, how he's going to utilize the space, you know, in addition to the aesthetic, you know, pieces and things like that, shape of the walkway and how far from the garage he wanted to be and everything like that. Then I think ChatGPT may have helped a little bit there at the end, but --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. STEFANIDIS: -- yes, that's what we've put together and that's what we came up with to best suit his needs.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: How long have you owned the property?

MR. BARNICLE: Five years. Just past five years in March. It was, I purchased it and it needed a lot of indoor and outdoor repair. So, each year I've done some significant project. This is the last piece of the puzzle. I waited to do the front last so that anything I did wouldn't get trampled upon.

MR. STEFANIDIS: I started in the back and now we're trying to get the front together.

MR. BARNICLE: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You've done a nice job with your removal. I live behind you; I actually got one of your letters.

MR. BARNICLE: Oh, thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Do you have any objections?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: None, no.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: When I first read it, I was like, okay, where are we putting a 33-foot driveway, and then I saw where it was, I was like okay.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Your letter was kind of deceiving which I understand is what the Village sends out, but as I'm looking at it now, I have no concerns.

MR. BARNICLE: One neighbor did come over with that concern, and as soon as I showed him the picture, he understood.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, I got it. Same thing.

MR. BARNICLE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, you can have a seat.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Thanks.

MR. BARNICLE: Thank you.

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

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, I will close it down for deliberation.
Take lead?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Sure. So, my sentiments are the same as yours. At least initially, I was like what are you doing there? Then I looked more closely at the materials in the packet and, you know, recognizing that the lots are larger in the estates portion there, and this makes sense to me. No neighbor opposition, and it ties in nicely. Everything is really well integrated. You can't always try to trust ChatGPT, it does some funky things periodically, but overall, I can get behind this and support this, and I like the fact that none of the neighbors, including our distinguished Board member here, you --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I figured I'd hear it tonight.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: -- had no issues with it and that goes --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: As I'm looking at it, no. He's not wrong, I mean, Burton is kind of a cut-through out to --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, I use it periodically.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, as do I.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes. So, I'm in support of it, that's the short of it.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Any other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll move.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And I'll second.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Drake.

COMMISSIONER DRAKE: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Siavelis. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That's okay. Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Chair Jaffe.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes.

Congratulations.

MR. STEFANIDIS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: You're welcome.

MR. BARNICLE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:41 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 #26-015

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

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BENJAMIN JAFFE, Chairperson
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK
TOM DRAKE

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
NOAH ARCE, Intern

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Then let's move to Agenda Item E, 1161 North Hickory Avenue, ZBA #26-015.

Okay, so we remind you that you're still under oath.

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And then could I get your name and address, please?

MS. FRICKENSMITH: Destiny Frickensmith, 2330 South Grover Road, Apartment 2093 in Arlington Heights.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, Staff report.

MR. OSOBA: The Petitioner is proposing to construct a one-story frame addition in the rear of the existing residence. Earlier this year, the Petitioner received approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to construct a two-story frame addition on the existing home and maintain the existing non-conforming north side setback of 2.61 feet where a minimum of five feet is required, and that ZBA case is ZBA #25-055. The Petitioner has revised the proposal to extend the one-story addition 15 feet further into the rear yard and maintain that same existing non-conforming 2.61-foot north side setback. The proposal increases the non-conforming condition that was previously approved by the ZBA.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 2.39-foot variation from Chapter 29, Section 5.1-3.3(b) to construct a one-story addition 2.61 feet from the north side property line where a minimum side setback of five feet is required and one foot for the eave.

MS. FRICKENSMITH: So, with this request, the house is not going to encroach any further over the existing setback. It's just going to follow in line with that existing condition.

MR. PURDOM: Basically, we had it approved at a certain square footage. It was a spec house, and we started working with the client who wanted a larger addition. Once we got to the permit stage, we extended that addition off the back. We're still going in line with the existing house, we just added 154 square feet to that addition. So, now we're requesting that same variation of building in line with the existing house, but a little bit larger.

We're not changing anything to the design of the house. Design approval has already been approved. We're in the permitting process right now. They just had us update the variance because we're asking for a little bit more.

Again, we're not going past the existing side, and it is the minimum amount. As we went further back, we actually reduced some of the front porch so that the square footage stayed within the approved impervious square footage. I believe that is it.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Dave, you have the lead on this?

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes. So, that's been boarded up for quite a while now.

MR. PURDOM: Correct, yes. We almost got the permit, and then during the permit review, they told us that we needed to update the variance because we extended the square footage for the potential client. They haven't

signed yet and this is getting them to sign once everything is approved.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Okay, so you guys own it.

MR. PURDOM: Yes, so we own it, and then we're trying it for someone but we haven't gotten the contract because they wanted a larger addition.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: And any neighbor --

MR. PURDOM: No, we haven't heard any feedback at all, so negative or positive, but it was previously approved and we didn't hear anything at the first one either.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: It's a small neighborhood, correct?

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: A lot of houses or property.

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I mean, it's just boarded up though, too.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes, and it's ready to go.

MR. PURDOM: Yes, we've been trying to get this one approved for a while.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Who's going to, the neighbors -- where am I go to lodge a complaint or lodge an issue, right?

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: My dog always walks by, there are animals.

MR. PURDOM: Yes, we're trying to get that one going as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Anyways, I think it would be a good addition to the neighborhood. Just it's not making, you know, it's not encroaching any more than it already is.

MR. PURDOM: Correct. You won't even be able to see the additional square footage because it's at the rear of the house. So, the front of house hasn't changed except for moving the stairs and reducing some of that front porch.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Kevin, did you see the zoning comments/notes from, actually from Dan, the Planning and Community Development, about the floor area calculations being inaccurate?

MR. PURDOM: I did, and we'll correct that in the current resubmittal, but it will still be all within the compliance.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, within the requirements?

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Are you contemplating that any approval by the petition, to take that into account, the decision on that? Is that where you're going, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: I want to make sure Kevin saw it, but --

MR. PURDOM: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: -- then based on my understanding, those would have to be updated so the permit could be issued regardless, right? So, the permit is not going to get issued until this thing is fixed. So, do we have to make it contingent upon this?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, I can speak to that. The requirement is there regardless of not requesting a variation for any floor area, and that would be reviewed as part of the permit. So, if it was above whatever the limit would be, they would either have to come back and ask for a variation or reduce it. But on the permit, if it's under that threshold, they would be able to approve it if the Zoning Board approves this variation tonight.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: So, your department will assume responsibility for ensuring that the dimensions are accurate and we don't have to tie it to an approval?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, correct.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: We don't have to do math in your last meeting.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, you're so kind and gracious.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I know that's where you were going. You're starting to freak out about having to do the math.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Right, I remember some of those nights, yes, we dodged a bullet.

Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Okay, you can have a seat.

MS. FRICKENSMITH: 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 down for deliberation.

Dave, do you want to start us off?

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes, I was just saying that I think it would be, you know, an improvement to the house. Obviously, it's been boarded up for a while. It seems like it's been a year or less, and it's not changing the front of the house and there isn't any complaints from the neighbors. It seems to have the approval, the same kind of approval of the place it needs to have. So, I don't have any other questions.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Yes, I agree with you. I remember when this came to us a few months ago and the current condition of that property is in desperate need of some type of rebuild/rehabilitation. So, if we have somebody who's going to make that investment; I'm willing to look at it under that light.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: We approved the 2.61 one, so it seems like this isn't really any different.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And that ties in to one of the elements, right, how long it is --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's been unoccupied.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Unoccupied, and that weighs heavily in favor of the Petitioner, plus the prior grant.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Agreed.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Is there a motion?

is. COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: I motion to approve the request as

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'll second it.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: 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.

Congratulations.

MS. FRICKENSMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Do we have other business?

MR. OSOBA: We do not.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I think we do have some other business, right? This is your last meeting as Chair.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: It is. It is.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Or last meeting.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Last meeting, period.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Last meeting, period, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, you skated without doing any math during your tenure, or at least under the gun. So, that was impressive.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: It's been a great ride, and a great team.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You did a great job.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: And a great team, most importantly.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Thank you all for being such a great team and teammates.

Any public comment?

MR. KOEBERNICK: I'm just here to fill in at next meeting, so I was just listening to see what you guys do up here.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All right.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You're prepared.

MR. KOEBERNICK: I am prepared now; I feel good.

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

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I move to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON JAFFE: Hearing none, all right.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.)

DRAFT

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