

ZONING BOARD

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

RE: 702 SOUTH CHESTNUT AVENUE - ZBA #26-016

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 July, 2026 at the hour of
7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THOMAS DRAKE, Chairman
RICK KOEBERNICK
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
CONNOR ROCKHILL, Intern

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, hello, everyone. I'm going to call the meeting to order. This is the July 13th, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Could Staff please take the roll call?

MR. OSOBA: Mr. Koebernick.

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: Here.

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: Chair Drake.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Here.

Okay, our next order of business appears to be the Pledge of Allegiance. The flag is in the corner. Let's stand, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Item No. III on the agenda is approval of our minutes from June 8th, 2026.

Does anyone have any additions, corrections, comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Hearing none, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll move.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Second?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second. I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Motion carries.

I'm going to go through the hearing procedures. Bear with me, it shouldn't take too long. We'll try to give you the short version here.

We have a seven-person Board here tonight. You will need four affirmative votes to get your petition approved. If you're the petitioner, you need to go four for seven. If your petition is denied, you cannot apply for a whole year.

The four elements that the Board is going to look at in order to assess your petition, and here they 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 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.

It is your job to convince the Board and sway us to approve your petition. It's not our job to pull the information out of you. So, keep that in mind.

A variation shall only be permitted if the evidence, in the judgment of the Board of Appeals, sustains each of the four conditions enumerated. If you miss one of them, we'll ask about that.

The format of the meeting. The Chairperson opens the agenda item, provides introductory comments, and then we'll get a Staff presentation which is a brief overview of the project and the variances being requested. Each of you that is the petitioner will have a chance to make your case by way of documents and testimony and any other affidavits that you want to supply. We will swear you in and you must state your name and the respective names for the record of anyone else speaking.

Also, members of the public that are here can speak on the application. The speakers will be sworn in under oath. They need to state and spell their name clearly. We ask when you come up to the podium, speak clearly into the microphone because we're recording all of the conversation for the minutes.

Anyone that's not a petitioner that is going to speak about one of the petitions, I'm going to ask you to hold it to three minutes. If you go to three minutes and 10 seconds, not a problem, but we'd appreciate it if you would be concise in any comments that you have.

The applicant can make a closing statement after any remarks that are made by the public, and present any other evidence or testimony that they want to supply to us. After that, we'll go into deliberation and then take a vote. So, it's pretty straightforward.

At the end of the meeting, when we've reviewed all the petitions, anyone from the public that wants to make a comment could come up and we'll listen to that. Again, three minutes is the time limit on those comments.

So, with that, there's no Old Business, we're going to move to Item V which is New Business. 702 South Chestnut Avenue, that is ZBA #26-00016.

If we could have the Petitioner come up, and if the Staff could read the report?

MR. BOJIN: The property is zoned R-3 Residential Single-Family District, and the Petitioner is proposing to expand their existing driveway all the way to the north side lot line.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A three-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-11.1(e) to allow a driveway to be built up to the side lot line where the required minimum setback is three feet.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Well, could you state your name, please?

MR. FLYNN: Gregory Flynn.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Address?

MR. FLYNN: 702 South Chestnut Avenue, Arlington Heights.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: All right, raise your hand.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, you've got the forum.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you. Forgive me for my public speaking skills. I'm behind a computer most days.

So, we currently have an existing eight-foot-wide driveway which funnily enough is not to code either, I think it's a minimum of nine feet. The goal was to be able to park our two cars side by side. We recently found out that it is good to be a two-car family when you have a little one running around. So, after our son was born, we bought a second car and I've been doing a lot of car swapping.

The other issue we have with our existing driveway is that, well, one issue is me not measuring how long the car I bought was before purchasing it. But when we park our two cars currently, we have, to not block the driveway, we have about an inch to the garage door and an inch between the cars. So, it's a little tight. The only car currently parked in the driveway is my son's little pushcart as we are accumulating more toddler toys as he gets bigger.

So, I learned about the setback requirement after trying to get posts for this job. Two organizations didn't mention it. I think that one based in Arlington Heights thankfully did point me in the right direction for the zoning, so we didn't accidentally go through the permit process or anything like that prematurely.

So, the goal, yes, is to go all the way to the side lot line. Again, we're a corner lot, so we're like, I get like, you know, if you build all the way to like the lot of your neighbor, it's like kind of annoying, especially if you have room to put a driveway elsewhere. We don't have that problem to the north side. I've talked to the neighbor on the other side of the street. He told me, "I don't care."

So, the other advantage here, too, is we have part of the foundation on the northwest side of the house, so that's the corner of the garage and the back fluctuates based on the contact with the soil. So, part of this is also to demolish the existing concrete in the area, put four pump jacks, forgive me, not the exact term, not my field of expertise. Then going all the way to the side lot line allows us to pitch the concrete to then shed as much water as possible because I'm learning the hard way that water plus foundation leads to a pretty sad time in my basement. So, I'm trying to do anything I can to get as much moisture away from the house.

So, that's kind of like of a brief overview. To address your four conditions for consideration specifically, first, again, my public speaking skills, excuse me. The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property if the variation is approved. We're going with concrete like most of our neighbors. My truck is also too heavy for asphalt anyways, which most of the driveways in the area are concrete. They go, and again this is anecdotal, most of the homes that I

see around me go to the right away from the house.

I know of I think two examples that went to the left and, you know, again, subjective, but I think that it doesn't look great to park right in front of the house, you know, like it's a strip mall. So, that's what I'm trying to avoid with expanding it to the left where I wouldn't need a variance. Again, the variance is only required because we are 75 feet wide of a lot. If we were 70 feet wide, the required setback would be zero feet, so that extra five feet is kind of biting me, but anyways, like I said, public speaking, and now I'm rambling.

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 unique circumstance here, it's actually kind of interesting in our block, is we are the only corner lot that actually frontages our driveway straight onto Chestnut. All the neighbors on every corner around have a rear garage which kind of solves a lot of the issues. Hindsight being 20/20, it would have been great to do that when I moved in, but we have already planted trees and done work in the backyard that I wouldn't want to rip up just to do this. I think this is simpler and easier.

The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and the intent of Chapter 28. Again, like if someone lived next door, if there was a sidewalk there, you wouldn't see me here because (a) I think it would look terrible and (b) it would be, frankly I think it would be an encroachment on someone else's property so I wouldn't be seeking this variation if anyone was directly next to me.

The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property. With my measuring, we've got about 17 feet 10 inches of width here. I was hoping to get 18 feet, but you can't win them all. I'm not going to, you know, I can't go two inches into the parkway obviously, that's a big no-no. So, you know, we got close with 17 feet 10 to make this look, I think it will look pretty good, and allow us to park two cars side-by-side.

Yes, that is a lot of rambling from me. I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, thank you. I think we'll see what questions the Board has.

Jeff?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Perfect, yes. So, if I heard correctly, you have three in the household, yourself, your wife and a young toddler?

MR. FLYNN: Yes, 24 months tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Awesome, congrats.

MR. FLYNN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, you have the two vehicles. Out of curiosity, what's in the garage now?

MR. FLYNN: The garage is partially a workshop for my carpentry hobby and is storage for, we have two strollers, we've got, like I said, my kid's car. I did try to fit my vehicle into the garage, but I would have to, I have a workbench in the back for woodworking, you know, I'd have to tear that all up. Our other vehicle, the smaller vehicle is a RAV4 and it used to just barely fit, but even like width-wise, it's just, it's not comfortable getting in and out, so it's --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, I got you, okay. Thank you for

that. So, a question I have, if I'm looking at this correctly, you're taking the driveway/sidewalk all the way back to the rear of the house; is that correct?

MR. FLYNN: Yes. The intent there is again to shed water, but also what I want to do is we have currently shrubs for privacy and decorative from the back lot line corner all the way up to the back corner of the house. In doing this, I would extend that up and I'll kind of like create a little bit of a private parking area over there, like hopefully like, well, I'm trying to find like a non-ugly way to lock a bicycle up outside that kind of keeps it out of the elements. I haven't been successful yet.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Sure.

MR. FLYNN: But hopefully I'll find something, I can lock it up over there so I'm not like in and out of the garage as much.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Are you looking to actually park your car next to the garage or that's all going to be in front of it?

MR. FLYNN: It's all going to be in front of it. The downspout at the northeast corner would make that very difficult. I also don't think that would, I just think it would look like crap to park a car out there. Really the width there is to help me be able to back my truck up on that side for like landscaping projects and stuff.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Sure.

MR. FLYNN: And then I can unload right there. Where it's currently, I have to go through the garage and get my wife's car out of the way.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, I mean, that's the one area I have a slight issue with. Would you be willing to potentially pull that off of the property line next to the house since you're not planning on parking there anyway, to leave your three-foot required setback and then from the house forward which would give you the two-car parking that you're looking for?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: To the curb from the house?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, from the house to the curb.

MR. FLYNN: I mean, I'd be open to it, but the advantage of, it's just nice being able to walk through there.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: No, I get that, and I'm not opposed to giving you some additional sidewalk quite frankly but, you know, I think if I'm looking at this correctly, you have 6.7 feet. I don't know that you need 6.7-foot of concrete next to the garage. I'd feel better if that was, you know, 3.7 feet, leaving three-foot of green space. If you're trying to get, you know, moisture out of your basement, you know, pitching it to a dirt area makes, works a lot better than, you know, just a paved area that's going to runoff faster.

MR. FLYNN: Oh, yes. The plan here with just past the lot line would be to put in either like evergreens or other shrubbery. So, then regardless of the --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got you. So, you're planning on doing that in the easement of the city or the Village.

MR. FLYNN: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Understanding that if the Village expands, you're going to lose all that work and all that plant material?

MR. FLYNN: Yes. I've already got a lot of, some cost along that line, and my neighbor behind me does, too. So, it would be a very sad day for a lot of

shrubs but, you know, it is, you know, at the end of the day it is the Village's property.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It is.

MR. FLYNN: I can't say anything about it, I can just make it look pretty, you know.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, are you more willing to support this if we condition it upon shrubs being planted there?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I think if you put some shrubs or something over there, that would work well. I'm not a huge part of having pavement or concrete up to the property line in general. I understand your hardship here with the parking and how that looks. Yes, if you put some shrubs there, I think that that would be fine.

MR. FLYNN: Oh, absolutely. I was actually just talking to my landscaper earlier in the week. The plan I told him was to go up to the front corner of the house once obviously all this --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got you. Well, I guess I should ask Staff, can we condition that they plant on Village's property?

MR. OSOBA: We can condition that they coordinate with the Village to see if they can plant on Village property. The Zoning Board does not have the authority to grant someone or force someone to plant something on Village property.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right.

MR. OSOBA: So, we have to word that carefully, but theoretically, you can have that condition be crafted so that the Petitioner would have to coordinate with the Village to see if additional landscaping could be included in that area.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Where does the Village property, what are the dimensions of the Village property in that north end of the house, north side of the house?

MR. OSOBA: So, where it is, if you can see on the image --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, and they're crystal clear in the --

MR. OSOBA: Yes, where this Rockwell Street is and it's kind of a dotted line, that is the street --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: -- and the curb is that line there, and then this is all landscaping to the property line right here. I don't have a direct dimension, but --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, from the curb to that line is Village property?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: What's on that property right now, in that area right there?

MR. FLYNN: Currently, so right in the middle is one of our lovely giant sycamore trees that drops bark all over my yard. Then from the back corner

of the property line, or I have a laser pointer, don't I? So, from this back corner here all the way up to here is a variety of like dappled willows, a couple of different evergreen varieties. We did an exterior one to save money to --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: In the Village's property you planted that?

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And did you seek approval from the Village before you did that?

MR. FLYNN: I think we got a permit for the patio that we put in, that was part of that.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, the answer is probably no to that question. But who maintains that strip of land adjacent to Rockwell Street and the curb?

MR. FLYNN: This?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. FLYNN: I maintain that.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes?

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Don't you find it ironic that it's the Village's property, but you maintain it?

MR. FLYNN: It's one of those ironic things that --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I count as a long-term resident here. I mean --

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Same as like everyone else.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, all of our neighbors.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: All of our neighbors, yes.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: I think most villages are like that.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I know. I know, and that's why I find it ironic as well that if we're trying to make some modification or some improvement, we've got to be careful about planting bushes in an area that you actually maintain, but you don't own.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Because you're still responsible for maintaining it.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes. Same problem with, do we know if there's any infrastructure underneath in that parkway?

MR. FLYNN: Do you know? This is, again, just --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: That's a question directed to the Staff.

MR. FLYNN: Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I believe.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes, I'm sorry. Yes.

MR. OSOBA: We don't have that information here tonight. We can certainly check, and that's one of the considerations that we have to take a look at and why it's more prudent probably from a Zoning Board perspective to have, if that's something the Zoning Board wants to include as part of a condition, that it's worded that the Petitioner is coordinating with the Village on the feasibility of it

because there's a lot of pieces to that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right. So, we basically just say work with Staff to coordinate any potential, got it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: With a deferral to Staff if they say it's not feasible.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Was that landscaping there when you bought the home? Was it there already?

MR. FLYNN: No.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Even the big trees that are out there?

MR. FLYNN: Sorry. The big sycamore was like the Village tree.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, I'm looking at Google Earth and there are some large trees here.

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'm like, okay, there's no way you planted those and they got that big.

MR. FLYNN: Yes, it's just the trees that --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: But you've, yes, again, the Village plants in their parkways and their right-of-way, so it makes sense. Okay, I have no further questions.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Is there a sidewalk there that runs parallel to the curb behind that on Rockwell? A sidewalk ends over there, it comes to a T, right?

MR. FLYNN: Yes, right there it ends. Like I said earlier, if there was a sidewalk here I think, you know, obviously the project would be --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Different?

MR. FLYNN: Terrible. I don't think there's any like pretty way to do that.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Can you tell us, is there a fire hydrant on that parkway there?

MR. FLYNN: No, the fire hydrant is here.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Right there?

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Other questions from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, sir, thank you. We'll see if anyone from the public has a comment. Is there anyone out in the audience that would like to speak on this petition? Going once, going twice right now.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, we're going to close it down then for Board deliberation.

Jeff, would you mind starting?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, no, happy to. Like I said, I don't really have an issue with the widening of the garage, or not the garage, the

driveway. I'm not thrilled with it running past the house. I understand some of the implications there so I can support this. We'll put a condition that they contact Staff to see if additional plantings, before you plant them, let's make sure you work with Staff on that.

MR. OSOBA: And Chair, through you, I would make a suggestion to that condition to be specific on the type of landscaping, because landscaping could be a broad variety of things and maybe that's what you'd like. But if you'd like more of a screening through shrubbery or that type of, you know specificity, maybe you can --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Right, like bring me shrubbery. Thank you, appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, with that in mind, you'll support it with, what, the condition of shrubbery being added?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Well, a condition that they work with Staff to approve shrubbery being added I think is the right way to word that, correct? Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: All right, I'll second that and support that.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: I have a concern, Tom, about where this shrubbery would be planted because if you plant it a little bit too close to the roadway, you can actually be extending your side yard onto the Village property or it can appear that way. Do you, can you tell us how far from the lot line you're going to plant that shrubbery?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Hypothetical shrubbery?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: The hypothetical shrubbery.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Can you answer? Could you come back up so we can record that?

MR. FLYNN: So, just to make sure I understand the question correctly, between, so that would be from here to like here kind of?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Correct. How far from your lot line north?

MR. FLYNN: I think the current cut is probably around like 2.5 to three feet and so I would just continue that bed, sorry, to here. So, we're talking about 22.5 feet here because that's what that number is.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Are you planning on replacing that sidewalk that's existing also?

MR. FLYNN: This here?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Right there, yes.

MR. FLYNN: Yes, because it's sinking the wrong way in.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Back pitch towards your house?

MR. FLYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Okay, I don't have any concerns.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Are you supportive of it if we motion with that condition as well about aligning with the existing shrubbery and not exceeding that set off from the house?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Other comments, anyone?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: I'm good as well.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: All right, with that, I will try to put a motion together that makes some sense. I move that we approve the petition as presented with the condition that, on the area adjacent to the house and the garage, they work with Staff to allow additional shrubbery be planted no more than three-foot from the property line.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: That sounds good.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Does that seem like a reasonable request?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And with deference to the Staff to consider --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, work with Staff. Yes, Staff would have full approve on that.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, could we have roll call, please?

MR. BOJIN: Yes. Mr. Koebernack.

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Drake.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes.

Motion passes, thank you.

Good luck with your project. You don't need to stay, you're welcome to stay.

MR. FLYNN: Great, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Have a good evening.

MR. FLYNN: You, too.

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

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 819 SOUTH BRISTOL LANE - ZBA #26-017

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 July, 2026 at the hour of
7:24 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THOMAS DRAKE, Chairman
RICK KOEBERNICK
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
CONNOR ROCKHILL, Intern

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, we're going to move on to Item B under New Business, 819 South Bristol Lane, and that is ZBA #26-00017.

If we could have the Staff go ahead and read the report?

MR. BOJIN: Thank you.

The property is zoned R-E One-Family District, and the Petitioner is proposing to construct an addition in front of the home. The proposed addition will encroach into the required front yard and will expand the building, which has existing non-conforming side-yard setbacks.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variations:

- A 2.25-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-0.3(a) to allow an addition that is set back 45.11 feet from the front lot line where the minimum required setback is 47.36 feet;
- A 0.05-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-0.3(b) to allow an addition that is set back 9.95 feet from the north side lot line where the minimum required setback is 10 feet; and
- A 0.31-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-0.3(b) to allow an addition that is set back 9.69 feet from the south side lot line where the minimum required setback is 10 feet.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Great, thank you.

Hello.

MS. RHOARDARMER: Hi, good evening.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Hi. Could you state your name?

MS. RHOARDARMER: Victoria Rhoadarmer.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, and could you raise your right hand?

(Witness sworn.)

MS. RHOARDARMER: All right, thank you for your help in explaining what's going on here. We are proposing and asking for permission to build an addition on the front of this house that is one-foot 11 inches in front of the existing front or west side of the garage. The existing conditions on the south side and the north side are preexisting. The house was built with the 0.05-foot on the north side, it was already like that so we are not changing that setback of the building, and the same applies to the south side.

We see some unique circumstances here personally. I'll start, I'll go through the houses over here. So, the house was originally built in the Scarsdale Estates, and all of those houses had the intent to be ranch homes. We're not seeking to impede on that design structure of the original neighborhood. The existing house already feels like it's a nice setback distance from the street. They have a good garden in front of the house, a roundabout driveway you can see, and it doesn't feel like it's encroaching on the street if you stand on their street. So, we're not looking to make sure that the house is any more imposing from the street.

Our intent is just to gain enough space on the inside for a very efficient kitchen design. So, we're just looking to accommodate just a kitchen that's updated enough with the modern appliances. The kitchen right now is currently the

original kitchen. I have photos of the original kitchen if you want to see it, and our proposed kitchen design, but that's what we're looking to do on the inside.

We're also not looking to block the view of the front entryway. So, you can see that little indentation that's seven and some feet wide, that's the front door. So, if someone were to come to the house, we don't want our addition that's proposed in the opposite hatched lines to interfere with like the view of where the front door is. We don't want it to get lost anywhere. So, that's one other thing.

The house already has a large gable on the front of the garage. It actually looks quite nice already. So, our double gable design adds to the home's, again, original design and intent, and we'll just add a second gable above the kitchen addition, tying in to the existing gable.

Our size of the addition is not near encroaching at all on the existing FAR like requirements for the lot.

To the point of not altering the character of the locale and the neighborhood, we're keeping the original style of the house like I mentioned with the double gables. We're keeping the ranch house, and we're using matching materials, the existing brick and the existing architecture of the house and the surrounding properties. We're trying to keep all of that intact.

Our hardship right now, I think I spoke to it a little bit already. We're proposing a small and efficient kitchen design on the front of the house. We actually already considered a larger addition on the back of the house which wouldn't require a variance, but that would accommodate today's kitchen needs and it would provide all the space for the new equipment in the kitchen, and they host all the holidays. So, that is what we were originally looking at, but the cost is prohibitive to the owners to do a large addition on the back of the house where that paver patio is now. So, we're trying to be more economical, scale it down to something that is using the existing space and reutilizing it and making as much of a minimal footage impact, but making the best and most use of the inside space.

Is there anything else that I didn't touch on or anyone has any questions?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I think you're good. Have you spoken to the neighbors at all? Have the homeowners spoken to the neighbors about this project at all?

MS. RHOARDARMER: Yes. So, we walked down the street taking all the measurements, because we were getting measurements up along the street, and some of them were outside. Everyone was walking, it was a nice spring day that it happened to be. Some of the neighbors came by.

Could I ask the homeowner who is here if she has gotten any comments or will that come later?

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: We can call her up if she has to speak.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: If she has some contradictory information that essentially contradicts what you just said.

MS. RHOARDARMER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I guess for my purposes, are you aware of any negative feedback for the three variances you're asking for?

MS. RHOARDARMER: No, we're not aware of any negative

feedback.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: And you said earlier in your presentation, the amount of space that you're adding on to the front, about how much is it different than it is right now?

MS. RHOARDARMER: It would be one-foot 11 inches from the front of the garage. So, the addition itself is six-foot-six from the front of the existing kitchen. So, we're only gaining 6.5 feet on the interior of the kitchen by 10-foot-wide, which is just enough as most of you know just to get a U-shaped kitchen inside.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Okay, yes, it's helpful to hear about your process and how you went through it and you were looking for the minimum amount of, you know, the variance and how you went through different plans. So, I don't really have any more questions.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else on the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: No? Good. All right, thank you.

Go ahead and have a seat.

We'll see if anyone else, is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak?

MRS. EIDEN: I'd like to speak for a moment, please. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Thank you. Could you state your name?

MRS. EIDEN: Evelyn Eiden.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Could you raise your right hand?

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Thank you.

MRS. EIDEN: You're welcome, and I'm at 819 South Bristol Lane.

So, I want to thank you all for your time and consideration of our variance requests to allow for a front kitchen addition at our home at 819 South Bristol Lane. My husband and I made Arlington Heights our home over 31 years ago, and it remains one of the best decisions of our lives. We raised our two daughters here, and today we are blessed to have them, our sons-in-law, and our four grandchildren under the age of eight living nearby.

Our home is the central gathering place for the entire family's meals, holidays and celebrations. However, our kitchen still has its original 1950's layout, cabinets and countertops. It is outdated, cramped, and no longer functional or safe for a multigenerational family of 10. We initially investigated building a kitchen addition at the back of the home. However, senior citizens on a fixed income, we discovered that the high cost of a rear addition far exceeds our budget. By keeping the kitchen in the front and extending it slightly, we could achieve a safe, functional and accessible layout within our financial means.

This design will maintain the aesthetic harmony of the neighborhood while allowing us to age safely in place. After dreaming and patiently waiting for over 30 years, I hope to finally make this dream kitchen a reality so our family can continue to grow and gather here for many years to come.

We respectfully request your approval, and I did talk to neighbors. We have dogs, so I'm out walking them, meet everybody out in front,

and we asked neighbors on our side of the street and across the street, and everybody said it's about time, you have our support, good luck.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No opposition whatsoever?

MRS. EIDEN: No, none, and I did ask, when Vicki and my husband and I walked down the block, we introduced ourselves, indicated what our intention was. One neighbor on the south side thought we were extending out on each side and I clarified that for him and said no, it's in front and it's a modest space actually. We have a lot of landscaping, I'm a gardener so I maintain everything out front very nicely, so it will aesthetically look very nice and pleasing on the block. It's a lovely block I have to say.

So, that's all I have to say. Thank you all very much.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, thanks for your comments.

MRS. EIDEN: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else who would like to speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, with that, we're going to close it down for Board discussion.

Frank, start us off?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes, thank you.

Thanks, Tom.

It's a reasonable ask in all three variances. We have two existing non-conforming uses that are obviously just here because they're non-conforming, the front yard setback. The petition was well prepared and presented. I don't see any kind of reason not to approve it, and I can definitely appreciate the multigenerational facts. I feel that my parents' house is kind of the headquarters for like my brothers' and all our families, so I appreciate that. I would be in favor of approving each of the three variances.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, I agree with you, Frank. Let's not lose sight of the fact that the second variance sought is for six-tenths of an inch.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And it's an existing non-conforming.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I did the math.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, it surprises me. Then the third variance sought is for 3.7 inches, and then the first variance sought is for 27 inches. I mean, that's pretty nominal, and we had a fantastic statement by the owner. Very well drafted, we could tell you spent time on that.

MRS. EIDEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And we appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Appreciated that, yes. No, I'll throw in the same thing. A slight correction, even if you'd put it on the back, you'd have been in here for the same three variances with a little bit different sizes. I live down the street; you guys did a great job with your house. This is very nominal; I can fully support it.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: I'm just thoroughly impressed that you used the kitchen sink from the 50's.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, you married a saint.

MRS. EIDEN: I tell him that all the time.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: That's in the record now.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: I'm glad my wife didn't hear you; I'd be getting a new kitchen.

MR. EIDEN: I've heard it for 34 years.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Then you're finally wising up, right?

MRS. EIDEN: For like a long time.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: All right, let's motion this up.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes, do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: I move to approve the three variances as presented.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Take the roll call, please.

MR. BOJIN: Yes. Mr. Koebernick.

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Hogaboom.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Footlik.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Portera.

COMMISSIONER PORTERA: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Lanaghan.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Mr. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. BOJIN: Chair Drake.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes.

Motion is approved.

Good luck with your new kitchen. You have a beautiful home.

MRS. EIDEN: Thank you all very, very much.

MS. RHOARDARMER: Thank you.

MR. EIDEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: You're welcome. Have a good evening.

MRS. EIDEN: You, too.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 1606 NORTH YALE AVENUE - ZBA #26-018

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 July, 2026 at the hour of
7:38 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THOMAS DRAKE, Chairman
RICK KOEBERNICK
DAVID HOGABOOM
FRANK PORTERA
PETER SIAVELIS
JEFFREY LANAGHAN
JOE FOOTLIK

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
CONNOR ROCKHILL, Intern

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Item C under New Business, 1606 North Yale. That's ZBA #26-00018.

If we could have the Petitioner come up, and if we could have the Staff go through the report?

MS. NADEEM: So, the Petitioner is demolishing an existing single-family house and building a new single-family house. Part of this construction will include a new driveway and the relocation of the new driveway. The driveway is proposed to be 32 feet wide. This is permitted within 18 feet of a three-car garage's front elevation. From there, the driveway would be required to be tapered down to a maximum width of 22 feet. The Petitioner is proposing to continue the 32 feet wide driveway past the allowed 18 feet from the garage's front elevation.

Therefore, the Petitioner is requesting the following variation:

- A 10-foot variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-11.1(c), *Maximum Driveway Width*, to allow a driveway that is 32 feet wide past 18 feet of a three-car garage's front elevation where the required maximum is 22 feet past 18 feet of a three-car garage's front elevation.

That is the conclusion.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Thank you.

Are both of you signed in?

MR. HENSELER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, could you state your name for the record, please?

MR. HENSELER: I'm Peter Henseler, architect with Thomas Architects.

MR. VARGHESE: I'm Denny Varghese, 1606 North Yale.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, could you raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, the floor is yours. Thanks.

MR. HENSELER: Yes, so the only thing I want to point out is this northern property line here, north of the, it's actually the side property line, corner side property line. The property is large, but actually because of that, because of the size of it and that being a corner side yard, it has somewhat of a restrictive buildable area. As you can see, it might be hard to tell what is the front of the house and what is the side of the house. When you're out at this intersection at Yale and Maude, you'll see that Maude, which is the street to the north, is primarily for multiple blocks the driveway access point for all properties that are like this.

So, this is a Residential Estate Zone, so just to the west of this property is one other property, meaning two properties on the entire block. So, we're requesting the wider driveway access beyond the 18 feet of the three-car garage because it's to the homeowner's benefit in terms of the planning of the home to position that garage as part of the north within the buildable area as we can allow so that they can, there you go, so that what you see to the southwest of the home, and that's where the brick pattern is, is the planned patio.

I can't recall if it was said in the introduction or not, but I'll point out this is not a constructed home, this is in for building permit right now which we just received the first round of comments back. Zoning was aware of this at the

time of submittal, and Engineering was aware of this at the time of submittal. So, they're awaiting word from the Board.

The other note about Maude Avenue which is the primary driveway access for all the homes or the properties along Maude there, is that because that's about 440 feet of block, the increase in driveway width that we're requesting is going from about five percent of that entire green space to each street to seven percent. Again, the reason for that is because of the garage being pushed as far north as we can get, it makes for that turn in and out of that third-car garage a little too tight. So, we're looking for a little added safety for that reason.

We feel it doesn't drastically affect the, or alter the character of the neighborhood in that sense. We've reached out to neighbors all within about 200 feet of the property. All have signed their approval. They've been presented what we showed here, plus a little more. I can let the homeowner Denny here speak so I'm not belaboring on too much.

MR. VARGHESE: No, I think you did a great job. So, my wife and I moved here, we live in the city, and we're looking to move to Arlington Heights and build our forever home. So, similar to the previous petitioner, we're trying to make this multigeneration for our family and close friends. So, we're talking about 20 to 30 years out, right?

So, part of those reasons is to make the access a little bit easier, but also my wife's family is pretty large. It's over 40 people in total. So, we do a lot of gatherings at our house and many of them are elderly with mobility concerns. So, part of the benefit of this is being able to have them park a little bit closer to the house when we have gatherings. Our neighborhood has no sidewalks in that area, so like you'd be on the street with the strollers and wheelchair as well.

As Peter said, we've talked to all the neighbors. They're in full support of this. We have no RVs or commercial vehicles. My wife and I don't have them so it's not supposed to be long-time storage at all. So, that's kind of the reason why we're trying to do this.

MR. HENSELER: Engineering Division is aware of the request and they are okay with it, which they've provided as comment as well.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, are you building an entirely new house structure?

MR. HENSELER: There's currently an old ranch.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: You're going to bulldoze that, right?

MR. HENSELER: Correct. We've been through Design Commission and which has been approved. It was the preference of the Design Commission to treat the eastern facade here which is along Yale as the design front of the home. Obviously, we're providing architectural character along the north side, but it was their preference to have that garage along Maude as well.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: With that, was the issue with the driveway width addressed by Design Commission? I don't see it in here.

MR. HENSELER: No. It was not.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, Engineering does not object to the proposed variance.

MR. HENSELER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: What's going to happen to all those trees? A lot of big trees in that property.

MR. HENSELER: A lot of the trees on the property are dead and coming out, some as part of construction as well. The landscaping itself in terms of the south scaping plan back there isn't determined yet. That will come later, they're not really part of the building permit. There is significant drainage being accounted for on the property, so on the entire west, I call it 15 feet along the property, is where we're dumping a lot of our rainwater and draining that way. So, we've discussed planting of, I'll call it water-friendly species, but we haven't determined the final plan yet.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: By water-friendly species, you mean plants or shrubs --

MR. HENSELER: Plants, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: -- that absorb a lot of water?

MR. HENSELER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And this lot is a little over 200 feet wide, left to right, as we're seeing it, west to east, east to west?

MR. HENSELER: Yes, that's the depth, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, when you say depth, you've measured, you're saying depth off of --

MR. HENSELER: Because that's the side property line, so the technical property width is that one --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, but that's the measurement that's being affected by the desired driveway is that western --

MR. HENSELER: The 200, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MR. HENSELER: And if you account for the parkway, so that thinner black line you see along there which is a drainage easement, that wraps around all the properties in this neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, if the screen, if the image was pushed a little bit, there you go. That's --

MR. HENSELER: There you go, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Is there actually a swale around?

MR. HENSELER: There is, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got you.

MR. HENSELER: So, there's a 12-inch culvert plan for this driveway extension from property line to street. You know, whether this is approved or not, obviously that needs to be accounted for.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: How many folks are going to live in this house as the primary residents?

MR. VARGHESE: Well, our goal is to start a family. So, we hope to until we get four at least. Then her mom and aunt will eventually live in the house as well, too. So, at least six.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: How many drivers will you have at some point?

MR. VARGHESE: Well, right now it would be, my wife is going to buy a car when we move into Arlington Heights, so that would be two, and then a couple of kids as they grow up.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, that's down the road.

MR. VARGHESE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Is the three-foot flare on each side for aesthetics?

MR. HENSELER: That's the, no, that's not for aesthetics necessarily. I don't have an aesthetic preference with driveways in particular, but no, just ease of turning in. So, that driveway width of 32 feet is the straight width with the allowed three-foot taper on either side that's otherwise allowed within the code.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Oh, okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: And when you're talking about the flare, you're talking about the feature right near the curb line?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MR. HENSELER: Yes, within that last 32 feet.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: On both sides.

MR. HENSELER: Or the three feet.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I would think you really need to buy a big snowblower before you buy anything.

MR. VARGHESE: Yes. We'll get a lot of exercise.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, definitely. That's a big driveway, plus your sidewalks and stuff.

MR. VARGHESE: We don't --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: What?

MR. VARGHESE: There's no sidewalks.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Well, you're going to.

MR. VARGHESE: Oh, yes. Around the house, yes.

MR. HENSELER: Yes, that's one of the challenges with the street I'll say because, and the design of the home which we won't be getting to too much, but just being on Yale, most parking might end up on Yale. So, providing more off-street parking along Maude I think is to our benefit which is why we need that entry walk that you just brought up, because otherwise, you know, walking through that drainage easement which we want to avoid, but we also can't provide a walk to the street there through that easement. It seems a little tricky.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: How many cars do you think will fit on this driveway assuming it gets passed and we grant you this variance and it's built as drawn?

MR. HENSELER: Within the property? I think there'd be three possible parked uncovered, meaning not in the garage.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, right. Three deep to the curb or three in width?

MR. HENSELER: Oh, no, three.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: You've got 31 feet.

MR. HENSELER: Yes, side to side.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Cars are 20-ish.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Ish, and then you double one behind it.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. Well, and I was going to ask, do you know how far the easement is? Edge of pavement to the property line, is that 20-ish feet I'm eyeballing there? You got 31 from --

MR. HENSELER: From the street to the property line?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, yes.

MR. HENSELER: Yes, it's about 15, I think it's 18 feet maybe.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, got it. I was eyeballing 20, but --

MR. HENSELER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: -- 18 could be right. Okay, so you got another car off the property as well. Three across, so three by, you know, six probably. I don't think you could get nine.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I don't have anything else.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: No further questions from me.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else on the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: No.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Does this house -- actually, I do have a question, I apologize. I said I didn't.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I was looking at the image. Does this house, or was this house abandoned? Was there anybody living in this house? Because it looked like it kind of fell in disrepair.

MR. VARGHESE: There was someone previously living in the house, correct.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay.

MR. VARGHESE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: It wasn't abandoned, not that you're aware of it.

MR. VARGHESE: No. No, no, there was someone living in the house when we purchased it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Okay, good to know.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, anything else, guys?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Nothing else, okay, thank you. You can have a seat.

Anyone in the audience who would like to comment on this?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: No, okay. We'll close it down for Board discussion.

Would you start us off?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Sure, certainly. I welcome the opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

So, I think after hearing the explanation, this is reasonable. At

first, when I saw the papers, I was really stumped by this. Well, not really stumped, but I was skeptical is a better way to refer to this, but it makes sense.

I understand what you're trying to do. You're bulldozing this house. You have a great piece of property; you're trying to utilize the configuration and the layout in a safe manner. You have a large extended family, you're hoping to have a larger nuclear family, right? This makes sense.

We have no neighborhood opposition. We have no opposition from the Engineering Department, which is good for you because if you did, that would be a different story for us, but with all that in mind, I could support this.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, sure. I don't love the driveway being this wide. I understand it, don't get me wrong, I do understand it. I do applaud you for bringing your mother-in-law and aunts and what have you into the family as well. Not an easy thing to do, but I do recognize that. Based on the overall size of the lot, I can support this.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, that's the thing. It's a little over 200 feet --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It's 20,000 square-foot, not counting the parkways around it.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Right. When you have a nice driveway like that and you have kids, that begets other kids in the neighborhood coming over, playing hoops there and all sorts of fun stuff.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes. Good luck having them there.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: So, you'll be having them like everybody else's kids do because they're going to be there on that driveway.

MR. VARGHESE: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: I was just going to say I know the neighborhood and there aren't sidewalks, so it's difficult for kids to get around in there. It's not a busy thoroughfare but, you know, a bigger driveway will help.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes, you have to keep them on that driveway away from the street.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, for sure.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: It was smart to get the neighbors to sign the document for you, and what you're doing is a massive improvement over what's there right now. I was in your front yard this afternoon and, I mean, I hope this gets approved because it just, you know, it needs to be done.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes. With that in mind, I move for approval of the variances set forth in the petition.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: So, is there a second?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Take the roll call, please.

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Koebernick.

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: Yes.

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. Siavelis.
 COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.
 MS. NADEEM: Chair Drake.
 CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes.

Motion passes, your petition is approved. Thank you and good luck.

MR. VARCHESE: Thank you, guys.

MR. HENSELER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: You're welcome to stay and you can certainly leave. Have a good evening.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.)

ZONING BOARD

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

OF APPEALS

RE: 3304 NORTH BETTY DRIVE - ZBA #26-019

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 July, 2026 at the hour of
 7:53 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THOMAS DRAKE, Chairman
 RICK KOEBERNICK
 DAVID HOGABOOM
 FRANK PORTERA
 PETER SIAVELIS
 JEFFREY LANAGHAN
 JOE FOOTLIK

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner II
 DARKO BOJIN, Planner I
 BASMAH NADEEM, Planner I
 CONNOR ROCKHILL, Intern

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, we're going to move on to the last item, Item D, 3304 North Betty Drive. That's ZBA #26-00019.

If the Petitioner could come up, please, and if the Staff could give us your report?

MS. NADEEM: The Petitioner is proposing a four-foot open style, aluminum fence. The fence will be located in the rear yard alongside the eastern rear property line as well as the northern and southern property lines. The rear property line faces North Windsor Drive and the front property line faces North Betty Drive. Lots fronting two parallel streets are considered through lots. Fences in rear yards of through lots cannot be over three feet tall if adjacent to a non-through lot. The property to the north of the subject site is not a through lot as it does not have frontages on parallel streets.

Therefore, the Applicant is requesting the following variation:

- A one-foot variance from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3(b)(1) to allow a fence height of four feet on a through lot adjacent to a non-through lot, where the required maximum height is a three-foot tall fence for through lots adjacent to non-through lots.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Thank you.

State your name please, ma'am.

MRS. LOVERDE: Lana LoVerde.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, could you raise your right hand?

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay.

MRS. LOVERDE: Okay, well, good evening, everybody. I am not only the Petitioner, but I'm also the homeowner of this property. My variance request is for the minimum needed to provide safety for my dog. It will keep her contained and keep her in the yard and keep animals, other animals out. As of right now, I have to keep her on a lead which she trips over, she gets tangled, it chokes her. I think having the freedom in her own yard would be good for her.

The proposed fence will be compatible with the height of the neighboring fences which are also four feet. It will not stand out as being different than any other neighboring fence that's already present, and it will be aesthetically appealing to all houses around.

The fence that I am requesting is indeed neighboring a non-through neighbor's yard, but that is not their front yard, it's actually their side yard. So, and due to the letters from all my surrounding neighbors in favor of my fence, I don't know how to use this, I'm guessing this is it?

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

MRS. LOVERDE: Okay, so my house, this is the non-through yard, backyard of the house, their front faces here. This is a cul-de-sac. I have largely, one, two, three homes there, and the house that faces over here. Everybody seems to be in favor of it, and again I think this will provide safety for my dog.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: What kind of dog?

MRS. LOVERDE: She is a mix. I have a picture; do you want to see it?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: How big?

MRS. LOVERDE: My dog?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

MRS. LOVERDE: She's about 20 pounds, but she's a jumper. So, I really think she would be able to jump a three-foot fence. I know she would. I have little things in my house --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: A three-foot fence is not a high fence.

MRS. LOVERDE: Yes, and there's coyotes in the yard and she will just take off and run. So, that's --

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: The coyote can get over that three-foot fence.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes, very easily.

MRS. LOVERDE: Yes, and I do understand that. So, I would not leave her out there by herself, but I would like to be able to read a book in the yard and let her run and enjoy the space that I have. I have a nice backyard and I'd love her to enjoy it.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: And this is for your northern property line only? The other two, if I heard that correctly, you're allowed to be four-foot; is that correct?

MRS. LOVERDE: I don't really know. All I know, I don't know, that's a question for you I think.

MS. NADEEM: The northern property line?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, that's the one that's adjacent to the non-through lot, right?

MRS. LOVERDE: That is correct.

MS. NADEEM: No, it would be for generally any fence in the rear yard. Since it's in the rear yard and it's adjacent to a non-through lot, it's any kind of fence that's in the rear yard that would be --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Got it. That part I get, so I guess the question I have is the through lot that they're adjacent to on the south, those can be four-foot; is that correct? No? It's three-foot for any fence in the rear yard?

MS. NADEEM: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay.

MR. OSOBA: If you're adjacent, if it's a through lot and it's adjacent to a non-through lot, that whole rear yard is more or less --

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: It doesn't matter, it's not just the adjacency, it's anywhere back there?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: So, just to get, and I'm sorry, just to get it for my own clarification, if this is one of the through lots down to the south, those fences could be four-foot?

MS. NADEEM: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Okay, got it. Thank you.

MRS. LOVERDE: And they are indeed four feet, the neighbors to the south of me.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Yes, got it.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: I have a question for Staff. What's the

spirit and intent of that code to be three feet?

MR. OSOBA: So, if you can see my mouse, I don't know if you can on the screen here, but this red property, this is the subject property and this is a through lot, meaning that you have frontage on the front which is here to the east and frontage here to the west. This lot technically does not have any frontage on the western portion of the property. So, theoretically, this house doesn't have this condition, but the code is written for all circumstances.

Theoretically, this house could have a yard that's a front yard on this side of the property, on the western side of the property. The intent of code is to match, to make sure that someone doesn't put up potentially a six-foot privacy fence adjacent to someone's front yard.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Good question.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: First of all, thanks for coming in here today. Do you have an existing fence on there now?

MRS. LOVERDE: I do.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Okay, the fence looks great. All of the letters are obviously from your neighbors?

MRS. LOVERDE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: And that gives us a good view of what your neighborhood is expecting here, so it's great. The Engineering Department didn't have an objection to it at all.

MRS. LOVERDE: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: So, I mean, it seems simple. I don't have any questions on my side.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: How long have you lived in the home? Maybe you said that, if you did --

MRS. LOVERDE: How long have I lived there?

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: How long have you been in the home?

MRS. LOVERDE: I've been there for 10 years.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: How old is this dog?

MRS. LOVERDE: She is eight, and I do walk her every day. I think my neighbors are tired of seeing me in my, you know, in my pajamas every morning walking my dog. So, they'll be thankful for this yard, or for the fence.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Fair enough.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, any other questions?

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Nice job in getting your neighbors to sign this by the way.

MRS. LOVERDE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, would you have a seat and we'll talk about this?

MRS. LOVERDE: Sure, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else in the audience who would like to come up and speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: No, I think we're good.

All right, discussion from the Board? Thoughts?

Dave, you can start it off.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes, you know, I just would say that I think the fact that there's a number of letters that spell it out pretty easily that they're in approval, obviously you have a good neighborhood and, you know, they're interested in their community if they're providing letters for you. So, that's it. I'll keep it to that unless there are any other questions.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: I like the fact that this is an open fence and not a privacy fence.

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: Yes, it's a nice-looking fence.

COMMISSIONER FOOTLIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER HOGABOOM: I'd like to make a motion to approve the variance as requested.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, can we have roll call, please?

MS. NADEEM: Mr. Koebernick.

COMMISSIONER KOEBERNICK: Yes.

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. Siavelis.

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: Yes.

MS. NADEEM: Chair Drake.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Yes.

The motion passes, your petition is approved.

I can't see you over here.

MRS. LOVERDE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Have fun with your dog and your new fence.

MR. LOVERDE: Thanks for seeing us. Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: You're welcome. Have a good evening.

All right, do we have any other business, Dan?

MR. OSOBA: No, we don't.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Okay, anyone from the public who would like to comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: Hearing none, do we have a motion to

adjourn?

COMMISSIONER SIAVELIS: I'll move to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER LANAGHAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: All opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DRAKE: We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 8:02 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