# VILLAGE OF LOMBARD INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT

TO: Zoning Board of Appeals HEARING DATE: November 16, 2005

FROM: Department of Community PREPARED BY: Michelle Kulikowski

Development Associate Planner

#### TITLE

**ZBA 05-19**; **734 S. Elizabeth Street:** The petitioner requests approval of the following actions on the subject property located within the R2 Single Family Residential District:

- 1. A variation to Section 155.205(A)(1)(C)(3) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow a fence in a rear yard abutting the front yard of an adjacent lot to exceed four feet in height.
- 2. A variation from Section 155.205(A)(1)(e)(2) to allow a solid fence within a clear line of sight area.

## **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Petitioner/Property Owner: Jeanne Palmeri

734 S. Elizabeth Street Lombard, IL 60148

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Existing Zoning: R2 Single Family Residential District

Existing Land Use: Single Family Residential

Size of Property: Approximately 8,320 Square Feet

## **Surrounding Zoning and Land Use**

North: R2 Single Family Residential District; developed as Single Family Residences.

South: R2 Single Family Residential District; developed as Single Family Residences.

East: R2 Single Family Residential District; developed as Single Family Residences.

West: R2 Single Family Residential District; developed as Single Family Residences.

Re: ZBA 05-19

Page 2

#### **ANALYSIS**

## **SUBMITTALS**

This report is based on the following documents, which were filed with the Department of Community Development on October 19, 2005.

- 1. Petition for Public Hearing
- 2. Plat of Survey

#### **DESCRIPTION**

The petitioner is requesting approval of two variations for an existing fence that was permitted and erected on the subject property in 2003. In 2005, staff found that the constructed fence did not meet all of the provisions of Village Code. The petitioner is requesting that the Village grant the necessary relief so that the existing fence can remain on the premises as it was constructed.

Site Plan NAGE EASEMENT 80 0 10.01 PUBLIC UTILITY / DRAINAGE EASEMENT 128.00' ₹ 6' Solid 30.47 Wood **HARRISON** 35.41 65.00 65.00 30.63 BUILDING 22.59 -20.00 4' Picket CONCRETE 28.00 WALK **ELIZABETH** STREET

Re: ZBA 05-19

Page 3

#### INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

## **ENGINEERING**

## **Private Engineering Services**

Private Engineering Services has no comments at this time.

### **Public Works Engineering**

Public Works Engineering has no comments at this time.

#### FIRE AND BUILDING

The Fire Department/Bureau of Inspectional Services does not have any comments.

#### **PLANNING**

In December, 2003 a fence contractor applied for a fence permit on behalf of the petitioner. The fence permit was issued for a picket fence four feet (4') in height to extend from the southeast corner of the house along the driveway to the eastern property line, south along the eastern property line to the southeast corner of the lot, west along the south property line for twenty feet (20'). The permit also included a solid wood fence six feet (6') in height extending along the southern property line from the southwest corner of the property to twenty feet (20') from the southeast corner of the property and along the western property line behind the house for approximately thirty-five (35').

Code requires that the portion of the fence adjacent to the driveway within the clear line of sight area be of open construction, which is defined as seventy-five percent (75%) open. The existing fence is approximately fifty percent (50%) open. Also, subject property is a reverse corner lot, meaning that the corner side yard abuts the front yard of the adjacent property. Therefore, four feet (4') is the maximum height permitted for a fence within the eastern thirty feet (30') of the property. The four-foot (45') fence height is only maintained for the eastern twenty feet (20') along the southern property. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting a variation to allow a fence in a rear yard abutting the front yard of an adjacent lot to exceed four feet in height and to allow a solid fence within a clear line of sight area.

Staff feels that an attempt was made to comply with the intention of the Zoning Ordinance when the fence was installed. Spacing was provided between pickets within the clear line of sight area to open up the fence. Also, the fence height was dropped down to four feet (4') within the corner side yard setback. It is how the neighboring property is situated, with the front yard abutting the rear yard of the subject property, that requires a four foot fence be maintained for the entire thirty feet (30') along the rear property line. If the subject property was not a reverse corner lot, the fence would be in compliance with the fence height regulations.

Re: ZBA 05-19

Page 4

Staff notes that a precedent has been set by the approval of a similar variation request less than two blocks away from the subject property (ZBA 02-04). Staff finds that the degree of non-conformity presented in ZBA 02-04 was greater than the non-conformity presented as part of this petition. In that case, the approved variation allowed the entire fence within the corner side yard to be a solid six-foot (6') fence. The variation request associated with this petition is to allow a ten-foot (10') portion of the fence to be six feet (6') in height. The remaining portion of the fence within the corner side yard meets the four-foot (4') maximum height requirement. Also, the portion within the clear line of sight area does have a degree of transparency to it in that there is spacing between the pickets. However, the spacing is not enough to meet the seventy-five percent (75%) open surface area requirement for fences within the clear line of sight area. The fence is approximately fifty percent (50%) open.



#### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Community Development has determined that the information presented **has affirmed** the Standards for Variations for the requested 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 variation:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested variation **does comply** with the Standards required for a variation by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Zoning Board of Appeals accept the findings on the Inter-Departmental

Re: ZBA 05-19

Page 5

Review Committee as the findings of the Zoning Board of Appeals and recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of ZBA 05-19, subject to the following condition:

1. The approved relief is only for the existing fence on the property. In event the fence is damaged, destroyed or is replaced, the new fence shall meet all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Director of Community Development

DAH:MK

att-

c: Petitioner

H:\CD\WORDUSER\ZBA Cases\2005\ZBA 05-19\Report 05-19.doc