

**APPROVED**  
**REGULAR MEETING Minutes**  
**NORTHBROOK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**MONDAY, AUGUST 23, 2021**  
**7:00 PM**

**Call to Order**

Chairman Decker called the in-person meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Members Buehler, Chen, Craig, Gorenberg, Len, Wolfmark, and Chairman Decker were present. A quorum was present.

Village of Northbrook Staff Present:

Jennifer Maisch, Zoning Administrator; Chan Yu, Deputy Director; & Gale Cerabona, Recorder

**Review of June 28, 2021 Minutes**

Member Len moved to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2021, meeting as presented. Member Buehler seconded the motion. By unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved.

**General Public Comments - Items Not Otherwise on the Agenda**

None presented.

**Public Hearing and Consideration of the Following Petitions:**

Chairman Decker announced that each docket would first be heard in the public hearing portion of the meeting. ZBA deliberation and decisions regarding the dockets would occur immediately following the hearing, during the regular meeting. It was announced that if members of the audience are not able to stay for the regular meeting, they can contact the Zoning Administrator for the results. Petitioners will be sworn in and should address the Board. Neighbors within 250 ft. were notified of each new petition. As required by state statute, the hearing notices for Docket ZBA 21-0005 and Docket ZBA 21-0006 were properly published in the Northbrook Star on or before July 28, 2021. Chairman Decker asked any audience members to raise their hands if they wish to speak before the close of the public hearing.

- a) **DOCKET NO. ZBA21-0005 (1944 SUMMERTON PLACE)**. Petition by Brian & Margaret Bruce for a variation to reduce the required minimum interior side yard setback on a property in the R-4, Single Family Zoning District from **6' to 4.66'**. The Property is commonly known as **1944 Summerton Place** (PIN No 04-16-214-023-0000) and is the site of a 1 ½-story residence. The variation is requested to construct a one-story garage.

Chairman Decker swore in Mr. & Mrs. Bruce. He asked if notice was given to the neighbors. Mr. Bruce advised it was.

Mr. Bruce said they bought the home in 1989 and have been making improvements. The request is to tear down two existing structures – a garage and a breezeway. It was built in 1950 and is a non-conforming structure. They would like to expand the structure to have a two-car garage. This set-up is common in the neighborhood and conforms to the pattern of many of their neighbors. To the rear of the breezeway, there is another structure that used to be a screened-in porch. Mr. Bruce believes this request is reasonable and will improve the home and curb appeal. The front of the home will be updated at the same time.

Chairman Decker shared information on nearby garages. Mr. Bruce concurred.

Chairman Decker advised a detached garage could be placed in the rear without variation approval. Mr. Bruce said they have the highest lot on the block. He explained same noting there is some flooding, etc. They don't wish to use yard space. The pattern of the neighborhood would be maintained.

Chairman Decker asked if the side yard setback is remaining the same. Mr. Bruce said it is.

Member Craig asked if this is a teardown and they are rebuilding on the existing footprint (3 ft. on the back and 9-10 ft. on the front).

Member Buehler said the existing one-car garage is near the lot line. He asked if the yard is increasing. Administrator Maisch stated it's just a different-size diagram. Mrs. Bruce concurred and expounded.

Member Len remarked the depth is 33 ft., and most garages are 19 ft. He asked if the variation could be reduced. Mr. Bruce said the garage is deep to accommodate two cars and storage.

Member Len moved to close the public hearing and begin the regular meeting. Member Wolfmark seconded the motion, and by unanimous voice vote, the motion was approved.

Chairman Decker said this applicant should receive a gold sticker as every issue is addressed, etc. Mr. & Mrs. Bruce thanked the Chair.

Chairman Decker said it's an improvement to the neighborhood.

Member Len moved to accept the proposed variation to reduce the required minimum interior side yard setback on a property in the R-4, Single Family Zoning District from **6' to 4.66'**. The Property is commonly known as **1944 Summerton Place** (PIN No 04-16-214-023-0000) and is the site of a 1 ½-story residence. The variation is requested to construct a one-story garage. Member Buehler seconded the motion, and by unanimous voice vote, the motion was approved.

- b) **DOCKET NO. ZBA21-0006 (502 GREENWOOD ROAD)**. Petition by North Shore Group Construction LLC, 50 Lakeview Parkway #121, Vernon Hills, IL 60061, on behalf of the property owner, Amazing Home Developers LLC, 50 Lakeview Parkway #121, Vernon Hills, IL 60061 for an exception to increase the maximum fence height in the required front yard from **3' to 6'** on a property in the R-3, Single Family Zoning District. The Property is commonly known as **502 Greenwood Road** (PIN No 04-04-302-001-0000) and is the site of a new single family residence. The exception is requested to construct a new aluminum fence, masonry posts, and entry gate.

Chairman Decker swore in Carl Smolov who is representing the owner. He asked if notice was given to the neighbors. Mr. Smolov advised it was. Mr. Smolov said he is looking to increase the fence height. Posts are 6 ft. high, and a double gate will open inward. A PVC fence will be placed at the side and rear of property.

Chairman Decker asked:

- For further information - Mr. Smolov said this is the last house on the block; homes are newly-constructed. There is a turnaround at the end of the street.
- About the need for a higher fence - Mr. Smolov said the owner wants security. There is new construction that have this as well. This would blend in with other homes. Most homes are brick. The house is brick and limestone.
- If Petitioner feels this house at the end of the street needs more security than at the beginning of the street - Mr. Smolov said there is a corporation next door.

Member Len asked:

- Regarding the 6 ft. fence, if the topography is high - Mr. Smolov said there is a storm sewer but most of the area is level.

- If the piers are 6 ft. and the fence is lower - Mr. Smolov concurred and said the gate is the high point.
- Administrator Maisch if there is any other fence this high - Administrator Maisch said there is not, but it is adjacent to offices. She noted an ornamental light standard could actually go up to 10 ft. by Code.
- If there will be lights - Mr. Smolov advised there would be.

Member Wolfmark asked about similar fencing and Mr. Smolov mentioned a nearby property.

Member Buehler said:

- He is troubled as to the need. A 6 ft. fence is not typical. He explained other scenarios that were declined - Mr. Smolov said the fence is decorative and see-through.
- Underwriters' is a great neighbor; not much traffic.

Member Wolfmark asked about Underwriters' chain-link fence. Mr. Smolov said it's mostly 6 ft. tall.

Chairman Decker asked if there were any objections from neighbors. Administrator Maisch advised there were none.

Contextual photos were shown.

It was asked, and Mr. Smolov stated some homes shown are in unincorporated areas but still require a variance.

Chairman Decker asked how far the setback of the fence is. Member Len guessed 5-15 ft. Site plan was illustrated.

Member Craig asked about the exact fence, gate, etc. Mr. Smolov said it is circled on the drawing. He noted the high point is in the middle at 6 ft. then lowers to 5 ft. on each side. It is wrought iron and see-through. It's more for privacy so one can't enter.

Member Len is concerned as there is no other house with a fence this high.

Administrator Maisch advised the setback is 15-18 ft. from the street.

Chairman Decker said the code allows a 3 ft. fence, and this is double. Administrator Maisch concurred.

Member Wolfmark asked what landscaping is proposed. Mr. Smolov would consider same. Administrator Maisch advised landscaping could only be planted on private property (fence may have to be moved back).

Chairman Decker asked if there are further questions. There were none. He asked Petitioner to emphasize the need for the extra 2 ft. Mr. Smolov said a 3-4 ft. fence does not give much privacy; one can jump over it. He is considering aesthetics; a small fence that is not see-through is not attractive. He noted this homeowner's son has a house on this block with a see-through fence.

Chairman Decker said there are no issues regarding design, composition or color.

Member Wolfmark moved to close the public hearing and begin the regular meeting. Member Len seconded the motion, and by unanimous voice vote, the motion was approved.

It was stated the issue is the height.

Member Buehler doesn't see a hardship. The foliage is heavily grown in this area.

Member Craig referenced other fences.

Member Chen doesn't see a reason. There are other security options.

The fence type and gate were identified.

Chairman Decker asked applicant if a 4 ft. fence would be acceptable. He mentioned this applicant could also return with a revised proposal with landscaping. Mr. Smolov said he would speak to the owner and perhaps return with a revised 4 ft. fence. Administrator Maisch noted the next meeting is September 27, 2021.

Member Buehler said just because neighbors aren't here to complain, that doesn't make it right.

Chairman Decker asked that minutes for the Sunset Lane fence petition be provided to applicant.

Member Wolfmark moved to reopen the public hearing. Member Len seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the motion was approved.

Chairman Decker said this meeting would be continued.

#### **Old Business**

None presented.

#### **New Business**

None presented.

#### **Adjourn**

Member Wolfmark moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m. Member Craig seconded the motion, and by unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gale Cerabona  
Recorder

The decisions of the Northbrook Zoning Board of Appeals are final. Any appeal of this final administrative decision of the Village of Northbrook's Zoning Board of Appeals must be in compliance with the Administrative Review Law, 735 ILCS 5/3-101 et seq and filed within 35 days from the date of the ZBA's decision.

The Village of Northbrook is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of this meeting or the facilities, are requested to contact Greg Van Dahm or Debra Ford (847-664-4010) promptly to allow the Village of Northbrook to make reasonable accommodations for those persons. Hearing impaired individuals may call the TDD number, 847-564-8645, for more information.