

# MINUTES OF THE OTTAWA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

September 15, 2022



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

## **Roll Call**

Present: Charlie Sheridan, Dan Bitner, Celeste Nielsen, and Earle Lecki. Also present was city staff member Matt Stafford.

## **Meeting**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Sheridan at 7:00 p.m. It was moved by Dan and seconded by Earle that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sheridan then recounted the city ordinance provisions for granting zoning variances, per Section 118-19(g)(3) of the city zoning ordinance (see attached). He noted that there was one item for consideration by the board.

**Property:** Zoned B (Single and Two Family Residential) Lot 4 in Block 51 in State's Addition in the City of Ottawa, LaSalle County, Illinois. Commonly known as 1024 Chestnut Street, owned by Robert and Connie Wawerski for the request of a variance to have an accessory structure in the front yard.

**Applicant:** Robert Wawerski

**Review:** Robert Wawerski requested a variance to place 16' x 12' utility shed in the front yard of a corner lot Because there is not space to place it in the back yard. The new shed will be placed on an existing concrete pad adjacent to the existing patio. The vote was 3 yeas, 1 opposed.

**Action:** It was moved by Dan Bitner to approve variance to allow the placement of a 16' x 12' (192 SF) utility shed in the front yard of the property located at 1024 Chestnut Street. Earle Lecki seconded the motion and it passed with a vote of three yes, one opposed.

Having no further business in front of it, Earle Lecki moved to adjourn the meeting; the motion was seconded by Dan Bitner, and ended at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Earle Lecki

## **ZBA Variance Considerations**

### Section 118-19(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 alter the essential character of the neighborhood and 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.