

**MINUTES OF THE OTTAWA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**September 15, 2016**

Chairman Charlie Sheridan called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the Ottawa City Council Chambers.

**Roll Call**

Present: Charlie Sheridan, Tom Aussem, Aaron Battistelli, Todd Volker and Vince Kozsdiy.

**Meeting**

It was moved by Aaron Battistelli and seconded by Tom Aussem that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved.

Chairman Sheridan opened the meeting and recounted the city ordinance provisions for granting zoning variances, per Section 118-19, G, 3 of the city zoning ordinance (see attached). Chairman Sheridan noted that there was one item for consideration.

**Item 1**

Property: Lot 5 in Countryside Subdivision South Unit 2 in the City of Ottawa, La Salle County, Illinois commonly known as 844 Kimberly Lane.

Applicant: Owners Lyle and Celeste Heusner

Review: The Board heard evidence with regard to the request of Mr. and Mrs. Heusner for a fence variance (Ottawa, Illinois Municipal Code, Sec. 22-126-1D). The Heusners live on a corner lot and wish to have a six-foot high, zero visibility fence rather than the maximum-allowable height of four feet and the required 50% visibility per city ordinance.

The variance was opposed by Katherine Purcell of Ottawa, who objected to the wall-like aesthetics that the fence would create in the neighborhood.

Action: After discussion of fence types and aesthetic impacts of fencing types, it was moved by Aaron Battistelli and seconded by Tom Aussem to table the variance request for one month to allow applicants to study fence types and fence location options.

Having no further business in front of it, a motion was made by Tom Aussem to adjourn; the motion was seconded by Aaron Battistelli, and the board adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

TODD VOLKER  
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.