

**MINUTES
CITY OF WOODSTOCK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
August 10, 2015
City Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER: A meeting of the City of Woodstock Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:20 p.m. by Chairman John Schuh on Monday, August 10, 2015 in the Council Chambers of Woodstock City Hall, 121 West Calhoun Street, Woodstock. A roll call was taken.

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Richard Bellairs, Timothy Huffar, John Schuh, Patrick Shea, Thomas Tierney, Lawrence Winters

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT: Howard Rigsby

STAFF PRESENT: City Planner Nancy Baker

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by L. Winters, second by P. Shea, to approve the minutes of the July 13, 2015 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals as presented. Ayes: Richard Bellairs, Timothy Huffar, John Schuh, Patrick Shea, Thomas Tierney, Lawrence Winters. Nays: None. Absent: Howard Rigsby. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no comment from the public.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING—309 McHenry Avenue—Variation of yard abutting a street setback for building addition and parking expansion

Chairman Schuh opened the public hearing for 309 McHenry Avenue and swore in petitioner Lynette Rugg, Crossroads Care Center Administrator, Woodstock. Ms. Rugg stated that the variation request is to improve the grounds and offer an additional entrance for patient and visitor access.

Chairman Schuh asked if the improvements would include paving of the gravel parking lot. Ms. Rugg responded that the gravel parking lot is not part of this request but future paving is being considered.

L. Winters asked the petitioner what they would do if the variations are not approved. Ms. Rugg responded that they would still construct the rest of the parking lot and they would have to look at building options.

Chairman Schuh asked if they had looked at how the planned widening of IL 47 would impact the project. Ms. Rugg responded that the existing building already extends further into the setback than the proposed addition.

T. Tierney noted that the petition states that the proposed addition will serve short term rehab and asked if the new activity room/activity is a requirement. Ms. Rugg responded that they need to provide the new entrance.

P. Shea stated that he also would like to see the gravel parking lot paved as part of the overall improvement. In response to a question, Ms. Rugg confirmed that the parking lighting will also be improved.

In response to a question from Chairman Schuh, City Planner N. Baker and the petitioner confirmed that the required public hearing notifications were completed. There were no objectors in the audience.

There being no further comments, Chairman Schuh closed the hearing at 7:30 p.m. and the Zoning Board members completed the Findings of Fact. A copy of the Findings of Fact is attached to these minutes.

Motion by T. Huffar, second by T. Tierney to approve the variation request as presented. Ayes: Richard Bellairs, Timothy Huffar, John Schuh, Patrick Shea, Thomas Tierney, Lawrence Winters. Nays: None. Absent: Howard Rigsby. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,



Nancy Baker, City Planner

FINDINGS OF FACT--309 McHenry Avenue

The Zoning Board of Appeals shall complete the enclosed form, which will be included with the Findings of Fact Report submitted to the City Council.

Request: Variation from the provisions of the Woodstock Unified Development Ordinance, Section 7A.3, Bulk and Area Standards, to allow construction of an addition that extends feet into the required 30 ft. yard abutting a street setback and UDO Section 9.12.Parking, Required Setbacks, to allow a portion of two parking spaces to extend a maximum of 6'3" in to the required 30' yard abutting a street parking setback.

Section 7.3.5 states that the Board may determine and recommend to the City Council a variation of the regulations of Ordinance when it finds:	Yes or No	Comments
1. The particular surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the specific property involved would result in a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations was carried out;	All yes	
2. The conditions upon which the petition for a variation are based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought and are not applicable, generally to the other property with the same zoning classification;	All yes	
3. The purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the monetary gain realized from the property or to alleviate financial difficulty experienced by the petitioner in the attempt to comply with the provisions of this Ordinance;	All yes	
4. The alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by the application of this Ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property;	All yes	
5. That the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhoods in which the property is located;	All yes	
6. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion in the public streets or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values with the adjacent neighborhood;	All yes	
7. That the granting of the variation requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the Ordinance to other lands, structures or buildings of the same district.	All yes	