



## **ANALYSIS**

### **SUBMITTALS**

This report is based on the following documents, which were filed with the Department of Community Development on May 27, 1999:

1. Petition for Public Hearing.
2. Response to Applicable Standards.
3. Plat of Survey, prepared by James T. Stowell, dated September 20, 1985, and modified to indicate proposed limits of residential addition.

### **DESCRIPTION**

The property is located at the northeast corner of Lodge Lane and Madison Street. The petitioner is proposing to construct an addition to the rear of their existing split-level house, and wish to establish the maximum footprint in which the addition can be constructed. The addition could ultimately be constructed entirely within the footprint that is established, but would likely be somewhat smaller than that footprint.

As stated above, the property is located on a corner lot, and is also somewhat smaller in both lot area (7,339 square feet, where 7,500 square feet is required) and lot width (fifty eight feet (58'), where sixty feet (60') is required). By Code, a building addition would have to be at least twenty feet (20') from Lodge Lane, six feet (6') from the interior side (east) property line, and thirty-five feet (35') from the rear (north) property line. The petitioner is requesting a variation to reduce the interior side setback to 5.86 so that the existing building line can be matched, and also to reduce the rear setback to six feet (6') so that there is more adequate room in which to construct their addition. The addition that is being requested would include a two-car garage and an expansion of the existing kitchen.

### **ENGINEERING**

#### Private Engineering Services

The Private Engineering Services Division of the Community Development Department has no concerns regarding the petitioner's request.

#### Public Works Engineering

The Engineering Division of Public Works has no concerns regarding the petitioner's request.

## **FIRE AND BUILDING**

The Private Engineering Services Division has no objection to the requested petition. The Bureau of Inspection Services of the Lombard Fire Department, however, has visited the site and does have concerns regarding the proposal. An electric utility pole is located at the northeast corner of the lot. Although no utility easement is indicated on the Plat of Survey that was submitted with the petition, the utility company will need to have access available to maintain the pole and utilities. If a utility easement does exist which is not indicated on the plat, then the building addition would have to stay out of that easement. If no easement exists, then a letter from the utility company(ies) approving the location of the proposed addition would be required.

## **PLANNING**

There are two variations being requested by this petition. First, the petitioner is requesting to reduce the interior side yard setback from six feet (6') to 5.86'. This request is being made for two reasons – to allow the existing house to be reconstructed in case of catastrophe, and to allow the building addition to match the building line of the existing house. Since the existing house angles slightly away from the side property line, the building addition would actually be slightly farther from the side property line than the requested 5.86'. Staff has traditionally supported variations which would allow an addition to match an existing building line, and since the variation is for less than two inches (2") and would also provide protection for the existing house, staff supports the request to reduce the required interior side yard setback.

The second variation is to reduce the required rear yard setback. Staff does not support this variation, as the petitioner has a number of alternatives available which would meet the parameters of the Zoning Ordinance. The first alternative, of course, is not to construct an addition, as homeowners are not guaranteed that additions can be constructed for any given house and lot. There are, however, alternatives for this particular lot which would allow an addition per Code. One alternative would be to construct a rear addition of approximately fourteen feet by thirty feet (14' x 30'), which would be large enough for a one-car garage and a small room addition. If a two-car garage is needed, a detached two-car garage could be constructed, which, if set fifteen feet (15') from the rear property line (the minimum rear setback for an accessory structure on a reverse corner lot) and four feet (4') from the addition to the house, would allow for an addition of eight to ten feet (8' to 10') in depth. This would provide additional space which would be almost twice as large as the existing kitchen.

Staff's concern with approving the requested rear yard variation is that the resultant addition would be too close to the house to the north. If this property was an interior lot facing Lodge Lane, then the north property line would be an interior side property line and the house *could* be constructed to within six feet (6') of the north property line; however, if the lot was an interior lot then the house would have to be set at least thirty feet (30') from Lodge Lane, not twenty feet (20'). With the addition only twenty feet (20') from Lodge and six feet (6') from the north property line, the addition will adversely impact the openness of the front yard of the house to the north.

Zoning Board of Appeals

Re: ZBA 99-15

Page 4

## **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Department of Community Development has determined that the information presented has affirmed the Standards for Variations for the requested interior side yard variation, and has not affirmed the Standards for Variations for the requested rear yard variation. Based on the above considerations, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Zoning Board of Appeals make the following motion recommending **approval** of the side yard variation and **denial** of the rear yard variation:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested interior side yard variation does comply with the Standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, and the requested rear yard variation does not comply with the Standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the variation to reduce the required interior side yard setback from six feet (6') to 5.86', and **denial** of the variation to reduce the required rear yard setback from thirty-five feet (35') to six feet (6') associated with ZBA 99-06.

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

---

David A. Hulseberg, AICP  
Director of Community Development

DAH:DCS:jd

att-

c: Petitioner