



City of Aurora

2nd Floor Council
Chambers
44 East Downer Place
Aurora, Illinois 60505
www.aurora-il.org

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Wednesday
April 03, 2019
6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Cameron called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Zoning Board of Appeals Members were Present: Chairman Cameron, Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Pilmer and Ms. Tidwell. Mr. Gonzales and Mrs. Owusu-Safo called in and excused themselves from the meeting. Mr. Elsbree arrived at 6:50 p.m.

OTHERS PRESENT

The following staff members were present: Mr. Sieben, Mr. Broadwell and Mrs. Jackson.

Others Present: Scott Gramme (730 Friar Drive), Michelle Noe Long (Long Supply, Inc.) and John Tebrugge (Tebrugge Engineering).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

19-0236 Approval of the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of October 3, 2018.

A motion was made by Ms. Tidwell, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, that the minutes be approved and filed. The motion carried.

19-0237 Approval of the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of December 19, 2018.

A motion was made by Ms. Tidwell, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, that the minutes be approved and filed. The motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Cameron said if you are here for an item that does not have a public hearing and you wish to speak to the Commission, we can give you 3 minutes to do so.

No one came forward.

AGENDA

[19-0156](#)

An Authorized Variance for the Property Located at 730 Friar Drive, to Reduce the Minimum Rear Yard Setback Requirement in the R-1, One Family Dwelling District, by Seven and a Half Feet, from Thirty Feet to Twenty-Two and a Half Feet, Pursuant to Section 10.5-5.1 of the Aurora Zoning Ordinance (Scott Gramme - 19-0156 / AU11/1-19.021-V - SB - Ward 1) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Broadwell said this an Authorized Variance for the property at 730 Friar Drive. The applicant, Mr. Gramme, is applying for this variance to allow for the construction of a sunroom addition behind the existing home. A little bit of background, this property is zoned R-1 One Family Dwelling District. It is considered an interior lot per the Zoning Ordinance. It is about ¼ of an acre. The existing home is about 2,050 square feet. You can see more in the Property Research Sheet. The Petitioner submitted a single family addition permit in February of this year for a 180 square foot sunroom addition. In your Legistar packet, you can actually see the permit. If you go to page 5 of the permit you can see basically the site plan of what was approved. The Variance again, they are looking to reduce the 30 foot setback to 22½ feet because they are about 7½ feet into the setback. One of the things that we found, and the Petitioner may be able to speak more to this, but as you can see, the property is at kind of an angle on the street and so the way it is angled is that the northwest corner is right on the 30 foot setback, which doesn't leave very much room for any additions to the home. Whereas kind of an informal review of the rest of the existing subdivision found that a lot of the other homes in the subdivision have generally like 6 to 8 feet between the rear of their house and the rear yard setback. I think that's kind of staff's approach to this issue based on the narrowness of the lot based on its shape. Any questions for staff at this point?

Ms. Tidwell said as I recall, these do not come with a recommendation?

Mr. Broadwell said they do not, but we do kind of provide insight.

Ms. Tidwell said is it correct then to say that if we were to approve this it would be consistent with prior similar actions of the city?

Mr. Broadwell said yes, that is correct.

The Petitioner was sworn in.

My name is Scott Gramme. I live at 730 Friar Drive. I'm the homeowner at 730 Friar. As said earlier, we applied for a permit back in February for a small sunroom addition on the back of our house. At that point in time I wasn't aware of the 30 foot setback when I had Jeff the builder in this subdivision draw up the plans and we just kind of submitted it. We were kind of surprised. We weren't aware of that when we did that. A little insight into what's going in our subdivision, if you are aware, we're on the far southeast side of Aurora. It is the last street before you get to the Toll Road off Mitchell Road. Our homes were built in '05. My house sold for \$354,000 back then. I have a hard time appraising it for \$300,000 today. I attempted to purchase a lot 2 over and I was going to build a smaller home on that lot, but with today's building costs could nowhere come close to meet the standards that we require in our subdivision and to build a house I would end up with a house with a lot more expense than what I have

today and a much smaller home. One thing I was short was a sunroom. So we chose to stay where we are at and hoping we can put this 12' by 14' sunroom addition on. That's pretty much my hardship on what we are attempting to do and hoping we can move forward at some point.

Ms. Tidwell said now it says sunroom. Is that insulated, non-insulated?

Mr. Gramme said it is fully heated, glassed. It is 4 seasons.

Chairman Cameron said in keeping with the style of the existing?

Mr. Gramme said absolutely. That's part of the covenants of our subdivision.

Chairman Cameron said have a comment. Assuming that this gets approved, you want to make sure that the new piece is re-barred into the existing foundation. I had a neighbor who didn't have that happen and probably spent \$20,000 to reattach the house to the side. So just make sure that it is re-barred in and that the soil conditions under the footing are also no black dirt.

Mr. Gramme said right.

Chairman Cameron said just those type of things. I'm sure your builder knows that, but I just want to make sure that you are informed of that.

The public input portion of the public hearing was opened. No witnesses came forward. The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Sieben said just to follow up on Commissioner Tidwell's comments earlier, a little background on the history of rear yard setbacks. Historically the City of Aurora has had a 20 foot rear yard setback. In the mid 2000's that was modified to a 30 foot rear yard setback and the reason for that was obviously we had so much new home construction back in the early 2000's was to try to obviously get a little bit more of a usable back yard for a lot of these new homes. In this particular case, with the pie shaped lot and this is a large ranch it almost precludes you from trying to add onto your house. Staff has never felt that an addition to the rear is really as impactful as something that might be to the side where you get into the side yard setback adjacent to a neighbor. Also, behind this is a farm field so I don't think there is much impact on this. The way we looked at this, it is still more than 20 feet to the rear. There is still a nice rear yard there. This is adding value and value actually to the whole subdivision. Even though we don't make a recommendation, that's kind of the history that we've looked at these.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Ms. Tidwell

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Pilmer

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Pilmer, Ms. Tidwell

NAYS: None

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Pilmer said they are all listed in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mrs. Anderson said it seems to be the best use of the property and trying to increase property value.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification, desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Ms. Tidwell said this is clearly a desirable addition.

4. Will the proposal maintain a compatible relationship with the traffic pattern and traffic volume of adjacent streets and not have an adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian movement and safety in the general area of the property in question?

Mrs. Anderson said it does not apply.

5. Will the proposal allow for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the property in question and have no adverse effect upon existing public services and facilities?

Ms. Tidwell said there will be no change in that regard.

6. Does the proposal take adequate measures or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to maximize pedestrian and vehicular circulation ease and safety, minimize traffic congestion, and not substantially increase the congestion in the public streets?

Chairman Cameron said there should be no change.

8a. Is the variance based on the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved so that a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if a strict letter of regulations were carried out?

Mr. Pilmer said this variance is based on the shape of the property and based on the testimony a hardship would result to the owner if the regulations were carried out.

8b. Is the variance based on unique conditions to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification?

Chairman Cameron said it is based on the unique conditions and the fact that the back yard setback was changed in the not too distant past.

8c. Is the variance based on an alleged difficulty or hardship that is caused by the ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property?

Ms. Tidwell said it is solely due to the ordinance.

Mr. Sieben said this is actually an Authorized Variance so this is approved by the Zoning Board, so we will be able to sign off on your permit tomorrow.

A motion was made by Ms. Tidwell, seconded by Mr. Pilmer, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried.

[19-0185](#)

An Authorized Variance for the Property Located at 361 Cleveland Avenue, to Reduce the Minimum Rear Yard and Interior Side Yard Setback Requirement in the M-2, Manufacturing District – Limited, by Seven and a Half Feet, from Fifteen Feet to Seven and a Half Feet, Pursuant to Section 10.5-5.1 of the Aurora Zoning Ordinance (Long Supply, Inc. - 19-0184 / AU21/3-19.009-Fsd/V - SB - Ward 4) (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Broadwell said this is for the Long Supply at 361 Cleveland Avenue. What they are proposing is for the construction of an approximately 2,500 square foot unheated warehouse addition, which includes a loading dock and an 1,100 square foot building for the business to expand its existing operations at this location. A little of background here is that this property right now is 3 separate parcels that are owned by the business and being used. There is actually also a Final Plat that will be in front of the Planning Commission tonight, but right now we are just here for the variance. The variance itself is for the interior and the rear yard setback, which is 15 feet on both sides in the M-2. So the Petitioner is requesting to have the variance for that to be reduced to 7½ feet. We have the Petitioner here and they can talk more about this in a minute. One thing we found during this process is that there is actually an existing 30 foot wide stormwater easement that runs kind of north of the existing building through the existing property, which the Petitioner has found pretty much limits their intentions to maximize square footage of the entire property for development and continued use of this business. That's just something to keep in mind. That's the background. Are there any questions for staff?

Ms. Tidwell said can you talk a little bit about the effect on what looks like parking that is there now?

Mr. Broadwell said they are adding some parking in the parking lot on the north side. There is also some parking on the street that they are utilizing. The parking requirement is 1 space per 1,000 square feet for the entire existing and proposed building.

Ms. Tidwell said and that will continue to exist?

Mr. Broadwell said yes.

Chairman Cameron said how many square feet are there total?

Mr. Broadwell for the proposed and existing?

Chairman Cameron said yes.

Mr. Broadwell said about 12,000 square feet.

Chairman Cameron said so they need 12 parking spaces?

Mr. Broadwell said yes.

Chairman Cameron said and that will be there.

Mr. Broadwell said yes. They have a few parking spaces in the parking lot and some on the street on Cleveland Avenue. Those are all being considered for the minimum parking requirement.

The Petitioners were sworn in.

I am Michelle Noe Long. I'm the Vice President of Long Supply. The work address is 361 Cleveland Avenue in Aurora. Our personal address is 1982 Meadowlark Lane in Yorkville. My husband and I here own Long Supply. This is actually our second location here in Aurora. We bought Sturgeon Metals back in 2011. Some of you are smiling. You may remember Dick Conover. So we bought Sturgeon Metals at 606 Prairie Street. We outgrew that. We've have grown our business 8 times in the 8 years that we've grown it. We are building this addition to grow our business here in Aurora and that's the reason why we want to build and really stay here, so that's why we're asking for this variance based on where the current building sits and being able to add on to this cold storage as we bring in new product lines for residential and commercial contractors in the greater Chicagoland area. This is one of two locations that we own. We also own a second location in Elmhurst, as we've grown the business. So we are asking for the variance so that we can really build on the building. As you will hear from the city staff, we were taken aback when we found out about this big storm pipe that runs through one of our plots and so we have adjusted and moved and finagled the building so we can maximize the space as we continue to grow and plant roots here in Aurora. Like I said, we've grown 8x. We are not done growing. We are not done taking the market share and we really want to be able to build this building and show the people in the greater Chicagoland area this is our corporate office and so that's why we want to do this expansion.

I'm John Tebrugge with Tebrugge Engineering. I did the plans for them. The one thing I would want to point out is we are also adding a loading dock to the front of this addition. That's going to help remove the traffic off of Cleveland because sometimes the trucks have to unload there or in their current parking lot, so this will be a great addition for them to be able to unload their materials. There is one section of existing building that is only about 6 feet off the property line. We were not asking to meet that, but that's why we wanted to keep it 7½ feet. It still met all their needs. We had to split up the building as another future addition to miss the 30 foot easement that's there, but that building would be future, but at least we can get this one up and keep them moving.

Chairman Cameron said I had one question. I assume that it is sheet metal products since that was what Sturgeon is. I had a question on what materials you have available.

Mrs. Long said so it is still HVAC supplies. It will be flat stock metal. It will be basically anything that a commercial contractor would need, whether it is flat stock, elbows. We also sell filters, so everything like that. The building that we are adding on the addition is considered cold storage, so anything that doesn't necessarily have to worry about the weather, so it could just be flat stock sheets of steel, elbows and things like that.

The public input portion of the public hearing was opened. No witnesses came forward. The public input portion of the public hearing was closed.

MOTION OF APPROVAL WAS MADE BY: Mr. Pilmer

MOTION SECONDED BY: Ms. Tidwell

AYES: Mrs. Anderson, Mr. Elsbree, Mr. Pilmer, Ms. Tidwell

NAYS: None

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Is the proposal in accordance with all applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Mr. Pilmer said they are listed in the staff report.

2. Does the proposal represent the logical establishment and/or consistent extension of the requested classification in consideration of the existing land uses, existing zoning classifications, and essential character of the general area of the property in question?

Mr. Pilmer said this is consistent with the general area and it is a logical extension of the existing use.

3. Is the proposal consistent with a desirable trend of development in the general area of the property in question, occurring since the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification, desirability being defined as the trend's consistency with applicable official physical development policies and other related official plans and policies of the City of Aurora?

Ms. Tidwell said it is a desirable addition.

4. Will the proposal maintain a compatible relationship with the traffic pattern and traffic volume of adjacent streets and not have an adverse effect upon traffic or pedestrian movement and safety in the general area of the property in question?

Mrs. Anderson said there should be no adverse effect on traffic as they are preparing to add on a loading dock so that would help traffic moving it off the street.

5. Will the proposal allow for the provision of adequate public services and facilities to the property in question and have no adverse effect upon existing public services and facilities?

Mr. Pilmer said there should be no impact.

6. Does the proposal take adequate measures or will they be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to maximize pedestrian and vehicular circulation ease and safety, minimize traffic congestion, and not substantially increase the congestion in the public streets?

Ms. Tidwell said with the addition of the loading dock there should be an improvement to ingress and egress.

8a. Is the variance based on the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved so that a particular hardship

to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if a strict letter of regulations were carried out?

Mr. Pilmer said the variance is based on the physical surroundings and the shape of the property along with the uniqueness due to the 30 foot stormwater easement along the northerly property line.

8b. Is the variance based on unique conditions to the property for which the variance is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification?

Mr. Pilmer said I would say yes they are unique to the property seeking the variance.

8c. Is the variance based on an alleged difficulty or hardship that is caused by the ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property?

Ms. Tidwell said yes.

Mr. Sieben said so because this is an Authorize Variance, the variance is approved so we will be able to sign off on your building permit.

A motion was made by Mr. Pilmer, seconded by Ms. Tidwell, that this agenda item be approved. The motion carried.

PENDING

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ms. Tidwell, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried by voice vote. Chairman Cameron adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

VISIT OUR WEB SITE FOR CURRENT AGENDAS:

<https://www.aurora-il.org/AgendaCenter>