



"Kirsten Wooters"  
<k.wooters@comcast.net>  
06/25/2007 04:46 PM

To <backenstoj@villageoflombard.org>  
cc <hulsebergd@villageoflombard.org>  
bcc  
Subject request for postponement of public hearing

Jennifer,

I read the inter-departmental review group report. In the description section I read the group's addition of a sideyard setback variation. I have prepared a document affirming two standards for the setback variation. I noted that it was these two standards that the group determined were not affirmed. As this is my first chance to address the group's addition of a setback variation, I wish to have the group review my standards prior to the village board meeting June 27. I realize this does not allow the group adequate time, so I propose allowing the group to properly review my requests given the addition of my addressing the setback variation at the July 25, 2007 ZBA meeting. This would then be brought to the August 9, 2007 Village Board Meeting. Please let me know if this is acceptable.

**Attached please find my affirmations to the standards for variation for the setback variation.**

Sincerely,  
Kirsten Wooters



ph: 630-629-9668    Response to findings and recommendations.doc    341 driveway pix for city.doc

Kirsten Wooters  
341 S. Grace St.  
Lombard, Il 60148

June 24, 2007

Plan Commission  
Village of Lombard  
255 E. Wilson  
Lombard, Il 60148

**Re: Variance Request for 341 S. Grace Street, Lombard, IL 60148**

***Petitioner's response to north side yard setback findings and recommendations.***

Dear Plan Commission,

The following is clarifying the original request as well as demonstrating current conditions of encroachment of north side yard.

Points to clarify:

1. Present driveway is shared and encroaches on northern neighbor as does his driveway encroaching onto mine.
2. The need to be able to simply rebuild with the same blueprint of the existing foundation if the existing home were destroyed. I want the peace of mind knowing that I did the right thing rather than trying to have variances granted during a time a hardship if the existing house were destroyed.
3. My present garage is detached as it was detached when I purchased the property three years ago.

*1. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located. The proposed variation will ensure that the width of the home rebuilt in case of a catastrophe would not be reduced from its present width and would still allow room for a driveway having a detached garage. We simply want to be able to rebuild the home with the same blueprint as the present foundation if a catastrophe should occur. Presently, the north side yard is a shared driveway. My garage is detached. The driveway paving extends from the north foundation of our house to the south foundation of our northern*

neighbor as a single surface, presently shared and encroaching on both properties as they always have been. This encroachment simply accommodates the need for each house to have a driveway. Each driveway individually is too narrow for a car, therefore, presenting the need to encroach. Two years ago both owners agreed to replace the common drive together at the same time and have the work performed as one job, splitting the costs logically by square footage. The owner of the house to the north wishes to keep the present shared drive the same in the future for his own welfare as well. City permits were applied for at the time of the work and performed in accordance to the law. If I were to rebuild with the required side yard width, my house would become narrower than presently and the side yard which is presently the driveway would be required to be widened. By granting the side yard width variation, the existing configuration of the house and driveway would be preserved. The proposed zoning variation is necessary to preserve the current configuration of this 1927 historic home, thereby preserving the characteristics of the neighborhood. The existing configuration of houses and driveways in no way presents detriment to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood. I simply want to rebuild my house with the same blueprints of the current foundation and still have room for a driveway.

*2. The granting of the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.*

As the zoning board is aware, the lot width is unusually narrow for this property. This property and the property directly north are both so unusually narrow that both properties have a shared, encroaching driveway due to the need to pass a car between both houses. Both driveways lead to their own respective garages. My garage is detached. Granting a variation for the side yard setback for reconstruction in the need of a catastrophe, would allow the house width to remain the same. The width of the house is already quite narrow. If this variation were *not* granted, the house width would need to be reduced from its original 1927 design, thereby creating a very narrow rowhouse-like appearance and an enlarged width of a driveway. The resulting appearance would be a driveway as wide as the house.

I want assurances that a home with the present width can be built on the property as well as a driveway with the present width and a detached garage incorporating the existing layout on the lot in the event the existing home were destroyed.

Submitted by,

Kirsten Wooters



341 S. Grace property on left side.



341 S. Grace property on the right side.



341 S. Grace property on the right side.