

Village of Bensenville
Board Room
12 South Center Street
DuPage and Cook Counties
Bensenville, IL, 60106

MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

October 5, 2021

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Rowe at 6:30p.m.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki,
A quorum was present.

STAFF PRESENT: K. Fawell, K. Pozsgay, C. Williamsen

JOURNAL OF

PROCEEDINGS: The minutes of the Community Development Commission Meeting of the September 7, 2021 were presented.

Motion: Commissioner Marcotte made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Commissioner King seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Senior Village Planner, Kurtis Pozsgay and Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell, were present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe.

PUBLIC

COMMENT: There was no Public Comment.

Public Hearing: CDC Case Number 2021-24

Petitioner: Walnut Grove Development, LLC

Location: 214 N. Walnut Street

Request: Site Plan Review

Municipal Code Section 10 – 3 – 2

Planned Unit Development

Municipal Code Section 10 – 4

With the following Code Departures:

Maximum Driveway Width

Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – 1

Tree Preservation Replacement Standards

Municipal Code Section 10 – 9 – 2.B

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2021-24. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki
A quorum was present.

Chairman Rowe opened CDC Case No. 2021-24 at 6:32 p.m.

Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Fawell stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated a certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development Department during regular business hours. Ms. Fawell stated Village personnel posted a Notice of Public Hearing sign on the property, visible from the public way on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated on September 17, 2021 Village personnel mailed from the Bensenville Post Office via First Class Mail a Notice of Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250' of the property in question. Ms. Fawell stated an affidavit of mailing executed by C & ED personnel and the list of recipients are maintained in the CDC file and are available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development department during regular business hours.

Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioner is requesting the approval of a Planned Unit Development at 214 N Walnut Street. Ms. Fawell stated the development entails razing the existing single-family home and detached garage to allow for the construction of 10 townhomes with attached two-car garages. Ms. Fawell stated the townhomes will be oriented towards the north, as opposed to fronting Walnut Street.

Ms. Fawell stated departures are being requested from the following Zoning Code requirements:

- Section 10-8-8-1. The maximum width for residential-use driveways is 10 feet; the proposed is 25-foot wide.
- Section 10-9-2.B. In order to proceed with the development as proposed, 15 existing trees on the site have been marked for removal. Using Code's tree removal replacement rate, 70 trees are consequently required. 20 new trees are proposed, 3 of which being street trees required of such developments.

Edward Kress and Mike Kress of Walnut Grove Development, LLC, were present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Mr. E. Kress presented an overview of the project. Mr. E. Kress stated the property is zoned for multi-use. Mr. E. Kress is requesting to have the fee waved for tree replacement as they are planning to plant twenty trees on site.

Commissioner Wasowicz asked how flooding/flow mitigation would work on site. Mr. M. Kress stated the property will be designed to store water in pipes under the driveways that will be held and allow to slowly dissipate into the ground. Mr. M. Kress stated all other run off water would flow to the creek nearby.

Public Comment

Marcin Urbanski, 216 N. Walnut St., Bensenville, Illinois 60106

Mr. Urbanski was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Mr. Urbanski spoke in opposition to allowing the proposed project to happen. Mr. Urbanski stated he lives in the home north of the property and that if this project was approved, he would be surrounded by townhomes. Mr. Urbanski stated his privacy would be gone because of the height of the proposed development. Mr. Urbanski stated his property value would decrease and he would never be able to sell this home. Mr. Urbanski stated things are tough already because of airplane noise. Mr. Urbanski asked if the current property would be raised and if so, he fears his property will now flood.

Mr. M. Kress stated water will flow to the south of the property and swales will be placed on the northern end of the property to keep water on site. Mr. M. Kress stated this would prevent Mr. Urbanski's property from flooding because of the townhomes.

Jakub Kawa, 213 Poppy Ln., Bensenville, Illinois 60106

Mr. Kawa was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Mr. Kawa raised concerns regarding flooding on this property from the current property. Mr. Kawa stated he fears his property would see more flooding from the proposed townhomes. Mr. Kawa is requesting more drainage be installed on the western portion of the property.

Mr. M. Kress stated the property would be pitched to have water drain to the east.

Mr. E. Kress stated he would review the matter with engineering to deem if the request to add a drain on the western end is needed.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed site plan as presented in the Staff Report consisting of:

- 1) **Surrounding Character:** The site plan for the proposed development is consistent with the existing character and zoning of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

Applicant's Response: The proposed development is located on a block with existing townhomes.

- 2) **Neighborhood Impact:** The site plan for the proposed development will not adversely impact adjacent properties and other properties within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

Applicant's Response: Site plan does not adversely affect adjacent properties.

- 3) **Public Facilities:** The site plan for the proposed development will be provided with adequate utilities, access roads, parking, loading, drainage, stormwater flow paths, exterior lighting, and/or other necessary facilities.

Applicant's Response: Site plan includes 25' access road and 20' X 17' parking pad adjacent to the 2 car garage.

- 4) **Environmental Preservation:** The site plan for the proposed development is designed to preserve the environmental resources of the zoning lot.

Applicant's Response: Site will have minimum impact on zoning lot.

- 5) **On-site Pedestrian Circulation System:** The site plan shall accommodate on-site pedestrian circulation from parking areas, plazas, open space, and public rights-of-way. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation shall be separated to the greatest extent possible.

Applicant's Response: Sidewalks are provided for pedestrian safety.

- 6) **Vehicle Ingress and Egress:** The site plan shall locate curb cuts for safe and efficient ingress and egress of vehicles. The use of shared curb cuts and cross-access easements shall be provided when appropriate.

Applicant's Response: Curb cuts or new curbs will be installed.

- 7) **Architectural Design:** The site plan for the proposed development includes architectural design that contributes positively to the Village's aesthetic appearance.

Applicant's Response: We have worked with the Village's building department on a plan that incorporates the aesthetic appearance.

- 8) **Consistent with Title and Plan:** The site plan for the proposed development is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed special uses as presented in the Staff Report consisting of:

- 1) **Public Welfare:** The proposed special use will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: Plan does not endanger the comfort, health and safety of the public.

- 2) **Neighborhood Character:** The proposed special use is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed special use.

Applicant's Response: There are existing townhome developments on this block.

- 3) **Orderly Development:** The proposed special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed special use.

Applicant's Response: Our project will complement the property to the north, whenever that site is developed.

- 4) **Use of Public Services and Facilities:** The proposed special use will not require utilities, access roads, drainage and/or other facilities or services to a degree disproportionate to that normally expected of permitted uses in the district, nor generate disproportionate demand for new services or facilities in such a way as to place undue burdens upon existing development in the area.

Applicant's Response: There will be no negative impact on utilities, roads or drainage.

- 5) **Consistent with Title and Plan:** The proposed special use is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: This project is consistent with existing townhomes and multi-family units on the block.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed planned unit development as presented in the Staff Report consisting of:

- 1) **Comprehensive Plan:** The proposed planned unit development fulfills the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, and other land use policies of the Village, through an innovative and creative approach to the development of land.

Applicant's Response: Building 10 townhomes is the best use of land.

- 2) **Public Facilities:** The proposed planned unit development will provide walkways, driveways, streets, parking facilities, loading facilities, exterior lighting, and traffic control devices that adequately serve the uses within the development, promote improved access to public transportation, and provide for safe motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic to and from the site.

Applicant's Response: We have included walkways, driveways and parking that adequately serves the development.

- 3) **Landscaping and Screening:** The proposed planned unit development will provide landscaping and screening that enhances the Village's character and livability, improves air and water quality, reduces noise, provides buffers, and facilitates transitions between different types of uses.

Applicant's Response: Extensive landscaping is planned to the west and north for existing single family homes.

- 4) **Site Design:** The proposed planned unit development will incorporate sustainable and low impact site design and development principles.

Applicant's Response: The townhome plan with the 2 car garage with 2 floors built over garage has minimum impact on land.

- 5) **Natural Environment:** The proposed planned unit development will protect the community's natural environment to the greatest extent practical, including existing natural features, water courses, trees, and native vegetation.

Applicant's Response: We are protecting the natural environment by adding trees and native vegetation.

- 6) **Utilities:** The proposed planned unit development will be provided with underground installation of utilities when feasible, including electricity, cable, and telephone, as well as appropriate facilities for storm sewers, stormwater retention, and stormwater detention.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Site Plan.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Planned Unit Development at 214 N Walnut Street with the following conditions:

- 1) A DuPage County Stormwater Management Certification is required;
- 2) PCBMPs are required. The plans currently depict an area for PCBMP under the drive aisle near the southern property line. Applicant shall provide detailed volume calculations for the proposed PCBMP showing the required volume is provided;

- 3) Applicant shall provide a soils test to determine the seasonally high groundwater table at the location of the proposed PCBMP;
- 4) Applicant shall revise the swale grading to Staff's recommended standard while still maintaining capacity to safely convey 100-yr flows from all upstream tributary area safely onsite. Applicant shall optimize the usability of the open/green space by either reducing the swale side slopes or shifting the centerline of the swale north to create larger areas in the yard with flatter slopes while still maintaining necessary capacity;
- 5) Parking facilities shall be redesigned to allow for safe turnaround access for the western garage unit;
- 6) The requested departure from Section 10-8-8-1, Maximum Driveway Width, be approved;
- 7) Applicant shall coordinate with Staff to determine an appropriate fee-in-lieu of tree replacement, to be approved by the Zoning Administrator;
- 8) Applicant shall submit color façade renderings of the proposed townhome development, dependent upon final approval by the Zoning Administrator; and
- 9) A final landscape plan shall be submitted, dependent upon final approval by the Zoning Administrator.

Commissioner Wasowicz asked if the adjacent Residents concerns would be addressed. Ms. Fawell stated they would be addressed during permitting with engineering. Ms. Fawell stated engineering's top priority to improve the sites and surrounding areas.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2021-24. Chairman Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Rowe closed CDC Case No. 2021-24 at 6:58 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Site Plan Review, Municipal Code Section 10 – 3 – 2 with the above mentioned conditions of approval. Commissioner Marcotte seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Planned Unit Development, Municipal Code Section 10-4 with the following Code Departures: Maximum Driveway Width, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-1; Tree Preservation Replacement Standards, Municipal Code Section 10-9-2.B. Chairman Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Public Hearing: CDC Case Number 2021-25
Petitioner: Blanca Rivera
Location: 500 E. Red Oak Street
Request: Variation, Accessory Structure Setback
Municipal Code Section 10 – 7 – 4.A – 3
Variation, Garage Location
Municipal Code Section 10 – 7 – 4.C – 9.a
Variation, Driveway Parking Pad
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – G.3

Motion: Commissioner King made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2021-25. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki
A quorum was present.

Chairman Rowe opened CDC Case No. 2021-25 at 7:00 p.m.

Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Fawell stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated a certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development Department during regular business hours. Ms. Fawell stated Village personnel posted a Notice of Public

Hearing sign on the property, visible from the public way on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated on September 17, 2021 Village personnel mailed from the Bensenville Post Office via First Class Mail a Notice of Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250' of the property in question. Ms. Fawell stated an affidavit of mailing executed by C & ED personnel and the list of recipients are maintained in the CDC file and are available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development department during regular business hours.

Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioner is seeking approval of the above Variations in order to construct a detached garage and driveway on their property. Ms. Fawell stated the removal of the existing structures and consequent redesign are due in part to existing garage access being impeded by a Village-owned lift station.

Ms. Fawell stated the proposed garage falls into the property's 12' corner side yard, and is approximately 2' from the lot line. Ms. Fawell stated detached garages are only permitted in the rear yard and shall be a minimum of 3' from property lines. Ms. Fawell stated the proposed driveway and parking pad also fail to meet Code's regulations, which require the pad be restricted to the width of the garage with a 20' depth before tapering down to the required 10' driveway width.

Marek Pilny and Hernan Rivera, on behalf of the property owner were both present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Mr. Pilny review the proposed plans and stated the main reason for the request is because of the Village's pump station location.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Public Comment

Chairman Rowe asked if there were any members of the Public that would like to make comment. There were none.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed accessory structure setback in the Staff Report consisting of:

1. **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: Proposed variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience,

and general welfare of the public. The variation I am asking is only 8 inches. It will be barely noticeable and it will not make a difference to my neighbors because the garage will still be built well within my property. Beyond my lot line there is a line of trees and a parking lot to a condominium complex. The variation will not affect my neighbors health, safety, comfort, convenience or general welfare.

2. **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed variation. There are many lots surrounding my property that have very old houses that were built before the title went into effect and are right now infringing on the regulation.

3. **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title. The literal enforcement of this title is creates a hardship for me because my lot is on a slope. There is a decline of 40 degrees between the front of the house and the back of the house. Therefore, where I am placing the garage is the only possible place on my lot I could possibly place my garage and still have 17' of drive way between the back of the house and the garage door

4. **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately by the applicant. The property is unique because it

has a public utility water drainage and pumps placed by the Village directly in front of the current garage door. The public utility water drainage and pumps make more than half of the current garage unusable.

5. **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property. The variation of 8 inches is the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title I find necessary to build a new garage on the property. I am changing the entrance of the garage from the side road (Park) to the back of the house. This placement of the doors takes up most of my usable yard space but makes the whole garage usable. Unlike what I have now; use of less than half of the garage because of the public utility water drainage and pump placement. I am using most of my backyard space as a drive way. The minimum I can ask for is an 8 inches variation to accommodate my new garage.

6. **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village. The current garage structure is old and unsightly. The title's intent is to maintain the Village construction uniform and safe. The 8 inches variation is minimal and a new safer structures is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed detached garage location as presented in the Staff Report consisting of:

- 1) **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: Proposed variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public. My garage is technically in the corner side yard now and it has been since it was built. However, my proposed garage will have the garage door facing Red Oak. The variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public because there will be a longer drive way thereby giving me, any other drivers, pedestrians and passersby longer time to see vehicles coming out of my garage and vice-versa.

- 2) **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed variation. My property is unique, there aren't many properties that are corner lots and on a slope, but even across the street they have a garage placed similarly as mine.

- 3) **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title. Actually, if I my proposed variation is allowed my garage doors will be facing Red Oak and therefore be placed in the rear yard. The only difference is the side driveway I am proposing, but it cannot be avoided because of the slope I have on the property. I couldn't possibly have a driveway from Red Oak all the way back to the garage because it would be too steep.

- 4) **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately by the applicant. The property is unique because it has a public utility water drainage and pumps placed by the Village directly in front of the current garage door. The public utility water drainage and pumps make more than half of the current garage unusable.

- 5) **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property. The proposed variation is the minimum I could possibly ask to be able to place the garage in the backyard facing Red Oak. The entrance from Park is half blocked by the public utility water drainage and pumps.

- 6) **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village. The current garage structure is old and unsightly. The title's intent is to maintain the Village construction uniform and safe. The new garage will be beautiful and safe.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed driveway parking pad as presented in the Staff Report consisting of:

- 1) **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: Proposed variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public. My proposed garage will have

the garage door facing Red Oak. There are 17 feet between the garage doors and the back of the house. The required access driveway is on Park Street and is 10 feet wide and 24 feet from the parking pad to the curb. The proposed pavement abutting and adjacent to the garage will be used as a patio not as parking spaces. I will be putting a patio set and barbecue on the area abutting and adjacent to the garage. There will not be a danger to health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public.

- 2) **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed variation. My property is unique but there are many properties in the area with patio sets next to the garage on pavement.

- 3) **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title. Because I have to change the garage doors from facing Park Street to facing Red Oak I am losing almost all my backyard. I want to extend the pavement to the side of the garage so I can have a nice patio area to barbecue with my family.

- 4) **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant. The property is unique because it has a public utility water drainage and pumps placed by the Village directly in front of the current garage door. The public utility water drainage and pumps make more than

half of the current garage unusable. Therefore, I don't have much choice but to change the garage doors to facing Red Oak and use most of my backyard. Also, the front and side of the property is on a steep slope and I can't use it to have a patio and barbecue there.

- 5) **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property. The proposed variation is the minimum I could possibly ask to be able to place the garage in the backyard facing Red Oak. The entrance from Park is half blocked by the public utility water drainage and pumps. Extending the pavement is an economical way for me to have an area to lounge with my family during the summer in the only area I have left of my backyard.

- 6) **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: The proposed variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village. The current garage structure is old and unsightly. The title's intent is to maintain the Village construction uniform and safe. The new garage and extended pavement and new driveway will be beautiful and safe.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Denial of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Denial of the Variation for Accessory Structure Setback.

- 1) The proposed garage shall be located a minimum of 3' from all lot lines.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Denial of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Denial of the Variation for Driveway Parking Pad Width.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Variation for Detached Garage Location Depth at 500 E Red Oak with the following conditions:

1. The pavement shall be pitched in accordance with the recommendations of the Village Engineer;
2. A Professional Engineer or Land Surveyor shall produce and submit the following items:
 - a. A determination of the base flood elevation (BFE) located on the subject property is needed. The FEMA flood insurance study (FIS) profiles shall be used to determine the BFE located on the site.
 - b. A topographical plan of existing conditions on the site shall be prepared. The topographic exhibit shall be prepared per all requirements of Section 15-33 of the DuPage County Countywide Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance.
 - c. The floodplain boundary shall be drawn on the topographic exhibit per the determined base flood elevation.
 - d. On a separate sheet, a topographic site plan of proposed conditions shall be prepared.
 - e. Any placement of fill within the floodplain due to the proposed work will require compensatory storage to be provided equal to at least 1.5 times the volume of floodplain volume displaced.
 - f. The compensatory storage must be located within the floodplain.
 - g. Cross-sections shall be produced and utilized to calculate the amount of floodplain fill and compensatory storage provided in proposed conditions
3. A discussion of riparian buffer determination, impacts, and necessary mitigation, if any, shall be provided. Due to the residential nature of existing land cover, it is likely that no buffer requirements apply, but documentation shall be provided regardless;
4. A DuPage County Stormwater Management Certification will be required for this project as floodplain exists onsite. Provide a completed and signed DuPage County Stormwater Management Certification Application. Provide a stormwater report in DuPage County tab submittal format;
5. A swale shall be provided east of the proposed garage and driveway improvements. It shall contain flows onsite along the eastern property line and direct flows toward the rear

- property line. The swale shall be shown on the proposed topographic site plan;
6. Double row of silt fence is required for disturbances within or adjacent to the floodplain. Show a double row of silt fence downstream of all disturbances on the site plan;
 7. The Village of Bensenville currently owns and operates a sanitary sewer lift station along Park Ave. The existing driveway to the existing garage should remain in place after the project;
 8. A frost protected foundation is required for the garage since the structure is over 600 square feet per IRC section R403.1.4.1; and
 9. There shall be a physical barrier, such as a fence (in accordance with applicable Zoning Code requirements), between the driveway parking pad and backyard patio area.

There were no questions from the Commissions.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2021-25. Commissioner Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Rowe closed CDC Case No. 2021-25 at 7:17 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Accessory Structure Setback, Municipal Code Section 10-7-4.A-3. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: None

Nays: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Motion failed.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Garage Location, Municipal Code Section 10-7-4.C-9.a. Commissioner Marcotte seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Driveway Parking Pad, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-G.3. Commissioner Marcotte seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: None

Nays: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Motion failed.

Public Hearing: CDC Case Number 2021-26
Petitioner: Domingo Soto
Location: 1201 W. Argyle Street
Request: Variation, Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Municipal Code Section 10 – 6 – 12 – 1
Variation, Driveway Location
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8.A
Variation, Driveway Quantity
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8.B
Variation, Maximum Driveway Width
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – 1
Variation, Driveway Parking Pad Depth
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – G.3

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2021-26. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki
A quorum was present.

Chairman Rowe opened CDC Case No. 2021-26 at 7:23 p.m.

Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Fawell stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated a certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community &

Economic Development Department during regular business hours. Ms. Fawell stated Village personnel posted a Notice of Public Hearing sign on the property, visible from the public way on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated on September 17, 2021 Village personnel mailed from the Bensenville Post Office via First Class Mail a Notice of Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250' of the property in question. Ms. Fawell stated an affidavit of mailing executed by C & ED personnel and the list of recipients are maintained in the CDC file and are available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development department during regular business hours.

Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioner is seeking approval of the above Variations in order to remove and replace portions of their existing driveway, which does not adhere to current regulations set forth in the Village Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Fawell stated the nonconformities are as follows:

- Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage: The property exceeds the maximum allowable impervious coverage of 4,200 SF (50% of the total lot area), with a current coverage of approximately 5,571.8 SF. (1,371.8 SF over)
- Driveway Location: Driveway pavement abuts the eastern lot line; a setback of 1' is required from interior lot lines.
- Driveway Quantity: Horseshoe driveways are not permitted by Code. A lot of this size is permitted only one driveway.
- Driveway Width: The maximum driveway width for a residential use is 10'; the existing is approximately 15'.
- Driveway Parking Pad Depth: Parking pads are permitted to go out 20' in depth from garage doors; existing depth is 21.34'.

Margarita Soto and Domingo Soto, property owners were both present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Soto stated that her father wants to replace the driveway as it currently sits. Ms. Soto stated her father purchased the property as it currently sits twenty-three years ago. Ms. Soto stated they are worried that if they remove the concrete in the front of the home, they would have issues accessing their driveway because of snow piled up at the end of the street by the Village. Ms. Soto asked if the Commission would allow a twelve foot wide driveway as a compromise.

Consensus from the Commission would allow a twelve foot wide driveway as long as the other requirements were met and the concrete in the front of the home was removed.

Ms. Soto stated they were opposed to removing the concrete in the front of the home. Ms. Soto stated the concrete in the front of the home would not be repaired, only the driveway. Ms. Soto reiterated her concerns with snowplowing during the winter.

Commissioner Wasowicz asked if the family has reached out to Public Works with their concerns. Ms. Soto stated they have not. Commissioner Wasowicz stated a call to Public Works could rectify their concern.

Public Comment

Chairman Rowe asked if there were any members of the Public that would like to make comment. There were none.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed variations in the Staff Report consisting of:

1. **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: The proposed Variations will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public as it is private property on a dead end street.

2. **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: The proposed Variations are compatible with character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variations as each residence on the street has a driveway.

3. **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: The proposed Variations alleviate an undue hardship as this is the driveway used to park our own personal vehicles.

4. **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: The proposed Variations are necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately by me as this is an existing non-conforming driveway and proposing to reduce non-conformity.

5. **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: At this time the Variation for lot coverage is being reduced by an approximate 805'.

6. **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: There are similar properties in Bensenville with my proposal. I would greatly appreciate your consideration to create a more feasible access and would better as it is currently lifted and does not look nice.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff is cognizant that total adherence to Zoning Code's requirement of 50% maximum impervious lot coverage is extremely difficult, given the lot size and existing principal and accessory structures. Ms. Fawell stated with that said, our recommendation is that the percentage of impervious coverage on the subject be significantly reduced in order to get as close as possible to the 50% threshold. Ms. Fawell stated this is our rationale behind recommending denial of the Variations for: driveway location, driveway quantity, driveway width, and driveway parking pad.

- a. Driveway location: All parking facilities shall be a minimum of 1' from all lot lines.
- b. Driveway quantity: Only 1 driveway shall be permitted for this property. All excess pavement of

the 10'-wide driveway horseshoe area included) shall be removed. Permits are required, and removal of pavement locating with the Village right-of-way will require separate approval from the Public Works Department.

- c. Driveway width: The maximum driveway width shall be 10'.
- d. Driveway parking pad: The parking pad shall only have a depth of 20'. The removal of the excess pavement allows for adherence to the Zoning Code's requirement of 1'.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Variation for Maximum Impervious Coverage with the following conditions:

- 1) All parking facilities shall be a minimum of 1 foot from all lot lines;
- 2) Only 1 driveway shall be permitted for this property. All excess pavement of the 10-foot-wide driveway (horseshoe area included) shall be removed. Permits are required, and removal of pavement located with the Village right-of-way will require separate approval from the Public Works Department;
- 3) The maximum driveway width shall be 10 feet; and
- 4) The parking pad shall only have a depth of 20 feet.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Denial of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Denial of the Variations for Driveway Location, Driveway Quantity, Maximum Driveway Width, and Driveway Parking Pad.

Commissioner Marcotte stated she disagrees with Staff's recommendations and believes the petitioner should be allowed to remove and replace the concrete as it currently sits.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2021-26. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Rowe closed CDC Case No. 2021-26 at 7:56 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage, Municipal Code Section 10-6-12-1. Chairman Rowe seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Driveway Location, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8.A. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Chambers, Marcotte

Nays: Rowe, King, Wasowicz

Motion Failed.

Motion: Commissioner King made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Driveway Quantity, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8.B. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Chambers, Marcotte

Nays: Rowe, King, Wasowicz

Motion Failed.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Maximum Driveway Width (Twelve Feet), Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-1. Commissioner Marcotte seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Driveway Parking Pad Depth, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-G.3. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: Rowe, Chambers, King

Motion Failed.

Public Hearing: CDC Case Number 2021-27
Petitioner: Juventino & Jovita Landin
Location: 1307 W. Brookwood Street
Request: Variation, Maximum Driveway Width
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – 1

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2021-27. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki
A quorum was present.

Chairman Rowe opened CDC Case No. 2021-27 at 8:02 p.m.

Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Fawell stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated a certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development Department during regular business hours. Ms. Fawell stated Village personnel posted a Notice of Public Hearing sign on the property, visible from the public way on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated on September 17, 2021 Village personnel mailed from the Bensenville Post Office via First Class Mail a Notice of Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250' of the property in question. Ms. Fawell stated an affidavit of mailing executed by C & ED personnel and the list of recipients are maintained in the CDC file and are available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development department during regular business hours.

Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioners are seeking approval of a Variation to increase the width of their existing 10' driveway – which is the maximum width for a residential-use driveway – to 20'.

Grecia Landin, daughter of the property owners was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Landin reviewed the proposed request with the commission.

Commissioner Wasowicz asked why there were being allowed a twenty foot apron as opposed to the recommended ten foot wide apron from the previous case. Consensus from the commission was to allow a ten foot apron should this matter be approved.

Public Comment

Chairman Rowe asked if there were any members of the Public that would like to make comment. There were none.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed variations in the Staff Report consisting of:

1. **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: The granting of the expansion of the driveway will not alter the essential character of the locality nor substantially impair environmental quality, property values, or public safety or welfare in the vicinity, fitting our situation under criteria

2. **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: The granting of the expansion of the driveway will not alter the essential character of the locality nor substantially impair environmental quality, property values, or public safety or welfare in the vicinity, fitting our situation under criteria

3. **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: Due to the small size of the driveway and the number of people who live in this home with a vehicle, we are unable to fit all vehicles. This causes us to have to park on the street or side of the driveway, which is not allowed on a regular basis. We need a reasonable size driveway in order to live comfortably on our property. We are currently deprived of reasonable use of the property that we live on. Giving us the necessary space to adjust to our living circumstance will help our family a great deal and relief us of our worry in having to park on the street or side.

4. **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: Each member of our family has a vehicle and given the space, it makes it difficult to park. Due to the small size of the driveway and the number of people who live in this home with a vehicle, we are unable to fit all vehicles.

5. **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

6. **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: The granting of this variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Ordinance and of the General Development Plan and other applicable plans of the Village of Bensenville and is the minimum required to provide us with the relief from undue hardship and difficulty on parking on our property.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Variation for Maximum Driveway Width at 1307 W Brookwood with the following conditions:

- 1) The 3' driveway extension to the east should be installed to pitch toward the existing driveway to control drainage away from the neighbor to the east;
- 2) Grading from the east edge of the new driveway to the eastern property line should be performed to not further impact the neighbor to the east; and
- 3) Driveway shall be in accordance with submitted application plans.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2021-27. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Rowe closed CDC Case No. 2021-27 at 8:11 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Chambers made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Driveway Width, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-1. Commissioner Wasowicz seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to add a condition for the existing apron to remain as is and shall be excluded from the requested driveway expansion. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Public Hearing: CDC Case Number 2021-28
Petitioner: Michael Stevens
Location: 830 S. John St.
Request: Variation, Garage Location
Municipal Code Section 10 – 7 – 4.C – 9.a
Variation, Maximum Driveway Width
Municipal Code Section 10 – 8 – 8 – 1

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to open CDC Case No. 2021-28. Commissioner Marcotte seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL : Upon roll call the following Commissioners were present:
Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz
Absent: Ciula, Czarnecki
A quorum was present.

Chairman Rowe opened CDC Case No. 2021-28 at 8:14 p.m.

Village Planner, Kelsey Fawell was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Ms. Fawell stated a Legal Notice was published in the Daily Herald on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated a certified copy of the Legal Notice is maintained in the CDC file and is available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development Department during regular business hours. Ms. Fawell stated Village personnel posted a Notice of Public Hearing sign on the property, visible from the public way on September 16, 2021. Ms. Fawell stated on September 17, 2021 Village personnel mailed from the Bensenville Post Office via First Class Mail a Notice of Public Hearing to taxpayers of record within 250' of the property in question. Ms. Fawell stated an affidavit of mailing executed by C & ED personnel and the list of recipients are maintained in the CDC file and are available for viewing and inspection at the Community & Economic Development department during regular business hours.

Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioner has submitted plans to construct a detached garage and driveway for the property located at 830 John Street. Ms. Fawell stated the proposed 16' driveway exceeds the maximum allowed width of 10' (for which a Variation is being requested) and is designed to connect to an existing apron. Ms. Fawell stated this driveway will serve a slab for a detached garage located in the interior side yard. Ms. Fawell stated an additional Variation being is sought as detached garages are only permitted in the rear yard, behind the principal structure on a lot. Ms. Fawell stated the Petitioner has explained that it would be costly to situate the garage in the rear yard due to the elevations of the property. Ms. Fawell stated albeit no building nor architectural plans were submitted, it is the intention of the Owner to construct a garage on that slab.

Michael Stevens, property owner, was present and sworn in by Chairman Rowe. Mr. Stevens stated Staff presented his case perfectly and that he had nothing else to add.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Public Comment

Chairman Rowe asked if there were any members of the Public that would like to make comment. There were none.

Ms. Fawell reviewed the Findings of Fact for the proposed variations in the Staff Report consisting of:

1. **Public Welfare:** The proposed Variation will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the public.

Applicant's Response: Both the width of the driveway or the position of the garage would have no effect on the health, safety, convenience or general welfare of the public.

2. **Compatible with Surrounding Character:** The proposed Variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed Variation.

Applicant's Response: Both the width variation and the garage variation would greatly benefit the property and the surrounding properties. There are no houses that are very close and the neighborhood is very diverse in design.

3. **Undue Hardship:** The proposed Variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this title.

Applicant's Response: Both variations would allow the driveway and garage to be built at a reasonable cost. It would allow the home owner to address the issue of lacking and safe parking. The variations would also help to lower the risk of building the garage further where the land is more depressed and soft.

4. **Unique Physical Attributes:** The proposed Variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.

Applicant's Response: A driveway variation would allow the driveway to match the width of the apron provided by the city and would eliminate the need to make a dog bone looking driveway. The variation on the garage would help to compensate for the dramatic level change from front to back. A steady decline of more than three and a half feet from front to back. Bringing the rear to ground "0" would cost over twenty thousand in stone alone.

5. **Minimum Deviation Needed:** The proposed Variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this title necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.

Applicant's Response: Even with the proposed variations the side walk, garage and driveway would still meet village codes for distance of buildings, distance of overhangs and distance of utility easements. We are only requesting a 16' variation in order to match the existing apron, and we are placing the garage as far back to the

rear as we can before being impeded by the property's elevations.

6. **Consistent with Ordinance and Plan:** The proposed Variation is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, this title, and the other land use policies of the Village.

Applicant's Response: With these variations being allowed the property would look complete and modern. It would be aesthetically pleasing and in keeping with the basic village policy and good taste. It would look very much no different than a modern home with an attached garage. The garage will be the same "A" frame style as the house with matching overhangs and front of house brick.

Ms. Fawell stated Staff recommends the Approval of the above Findings of Fact and therefore the Approval of the Variations for Garage Location and Maximum Driveway Width at 830 John Street with the following conditions:

- 1) The pavement shall be pitched in accordance with the recommendations of the Village Engineer;
- 2) A swale shall be provided south of the proposed driveway and garage pad. It shall contain runoff from the proposed improvements onsite along the southern property line and direct flows west towards the swale that exists near the property line further back in the yard. Show the property boundaries on the provided plat of survey with spot grades shown. Add proposed swale centerline spot grades that are lower than adjacent existing grades at the property line;
- 3) The proposed garage slab requires a thickened edge, such as a turned down footing; and
- 4) A letter of intent to construct the garage within a year of approval date is required to be signed by the Applicant, or said Variation shall be rendered null and void.

There were no questions from the Commission.

Motion:

Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to close CDC Case No. 2021-28. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Chairman Rowe closed CDC Case No. 2021-28 at 8:22 p.m.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Garage Location, Municipal Code Section 10-7-4.C-9.a. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

Motion: Commissioner Wasowicz made a combined motion to approve the Findings of Fact and Approval of a Variation, Maximum Driveway Width, Municipal Code Section 10-8-8-1. Commissioner Chambers seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Rowe, Chambers, King, Marcotte, Wasowicz

Nays: None

All were in favor. Motion carried.

**Report from
Community
Development:**

Ms. Fawell reviewed both recent CDC cases along with upcoming cases.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Community Development Commission, Commissioner Wasowicz made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner King seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.



Ronald Rowe, Chairman
Community Development Commission