

MINUTES OF THE OTTAWA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
April 19th, 2018

Chairman Charlie Sheridan called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM in the Ottawa City Council Chambers.

Roll Call

Present: Charlie Sheridan, John Stone, Dan Bittner, Tom Aussem,

Meeting

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Sheridan at 7:01 p.m. It was moved by Tom Aussem and seconded by Dan Bittner that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved.

Chairman Sheridan recounted the city ordinance provisions for granting zoning variances, per Section 118-19, G, 3 of the city zoning ordinance. Chairman Sheridan then noted that there were four items for consideration (see attached).

Item 1

The south 144 feet of the east 50 feet of Block 10 in Ottawa North Subdivision to Ottawa, La Salle County, Illinois, commonly known as 210 W. Joliet Street owned by Dennis & Mary Weyer, for the purpose of a request for a variance to construct an addition more than 50% of the size of the principal structure.

Applicant: Dennis Weyer

Review: Applicant original request was a variance to add an attached structure that was greater than 50% of the primary structure. He now intends to build a 24' x 30' detached garage structure. It was noted that the primary house structure is 900 square feet. The detached structure will meet the minimal 5' distance away from primary structure.

Action: Upon hearing applicant testimony and general discussion of the project and its impacts, the board approved the variance for 24 x 30 accessory structure to exceed the 50% rule by 60%. The motion to grant the variance was John Stone and second was made by Tom Aussem and it passed unanimously.

With no further business before it, Tom Aussem moved that the ZBA be adjourned. This was seconded by Dan Bittner and passed unanimously. The meeting was concluded at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Stone
Acting ZBA Secretary

ZBA Variance Considerations

Section 29 G,3 Standards for Variances

The Zoning Board of Appeals shall not recommend a variance from the regulations of this ordinance unless it shall make written findings based on evidence presented to it in each specific case that all the standards for hardships set forth are met.

- a. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in the district wherein the property is located.
- b. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances such that the enforcement of this Ordinance would result in practical difficulties or impose exceptional hardships due to special and unusual conditions which are not generally found on other properties in the same zoning district.
- c. The variance, if granted, will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent property.
- d. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
- e. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property and improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located, and will not overcrowd the land or create undue concentration of population.