

**MINUTES OF THE OTTAWA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**December 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, John Stone and Dan Bittner. Also present was city staff member Matt Stafford.

**Meeting**

It was moved by John Stone 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 24 in Griffith's Subdivision in the City of Ottawa, La Salle County, Illinois, commonly known as 900 Pearl Street.

Applicant: Owner of the property is Sebby Van Hoozer. Representing the owner was Cindy Callahan who anticipates buying the property.

Review: The Board heard evidence with regard to the request of Mrs. Callahan for a variance from the city requirement that ancillary structures be no larger than 50% of the lot's principal structure (Ottawa, Illinois Municipal Code, Sec. 2-F-4). Mr. and Mrs. Callahan wish to add on a single attached garage to an existing garage in order to store a motorcycle and second car.

Action: Upon hearing applicant testimony and general discussion of the project and its impacts, the board approved the variance. The motion to grant the variance was made by John Stone, it was seconded by Tom Aussem, and it passed unanimously.

Having no further business in front of it, Chairman Sheridan adjourned the meeting at 7:20 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.