

**CITY OF MASCOUTAH
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
#3 WEST MAIN STREET
MASCOUTAH, IL 62258-2030**

NOVEMBER 28, 2018

The minutes of the regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Mascoutah.

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Board members Chairman Don Taylor, Bob Scott, Kimberly Kilgore, Harry Friederich, Jim Kuehn, and Dean Smith

ABSENT

None.

ALSO PRESENT

Chad Murphy of CNR Homes

ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

A quorum of Zoning Board of Appeals members was present.

MINUTES

Minutes of the October 24, 2018 Zoning Board of Appeals were approved. All were in favor.

AMEND AGENDA

None.

BOARD BUSINESS

Public Hearing

ZBA 18.08- Lot Coverage Variance- 841 Tanzanite Drive

Chad Murphy of CNR Homes, property owner and builder of Lot 49 in the Crown Point Subdivision in Mascoutah, has contracted with a family to build a 2,926 square foot home, which consists of 2,827 square feet of house and 99 square feet of front porch. Mr. Murphy has turned in his building permit application and City Staff has noticed that one item does not conform to Code. Lot 49 is 10,875 square feet, meaning the maximum allowed square footage of the home could only be 2,719, since City Code states that the allowable lot coverage is 25%, where Mr. Murphy is asking for 26.9% lot coverage based on a 2,926 square foot dwelling. This variance request has been requested to approve an additional 1.9% lot coverage.

Notices were sent out to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property, and City Staff

received one phone call requesting clarification regarding fencing and easements. After clarification, this neighbor had no issues regarding the variance.

Smith questioned if Mr. Murphy has built other homes in the Crown Point Subdivision, which he affirmed he has built all of them, as that is his subdivision. Kilgore asked if he has had to ask for a variance before on any other houses that he has built, which Mr. Murphy responded no, because his other homes have been the standard floor plan homes, but this family has made some changes to the standard floor plan, which made the home larger, which caused the need for a variance. Kuehn asked how old the development was, which Mr. Murphy responded approximately 6-7 years old. Smith questioned the entrance to Topaz Court and if it would always only have one entrance, which Mr. Murphy said was correct, but it would be a dead end at the lake/pond. Only having one entrance to the Subdivision is a concern in the case of flooding. Taylor pointed out that it would be beneficial for the State to place a traffic light in at Route 4 by Dollar General once more homes are built in the Crown Point Subdivision. Kuehn is optimistic that the City has placed updated drainage measures in this newer development to avoid any substantial drainage issues. Taylor pointed out that this development also has a retention pond to help alleviate drainage issues. Smith asked Mr. Murphy if there were any drainage problems in the development currently, to which Mr. Murphy denied any issues. Taylor and Smith both affirmed that any drainage issues in Crown Point is strictly the entrance by Route 4 only.

Kuehn moved, seconded by Smith, that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the requested lot coverage variances.

Motion passed. AYE's – 6 – Taylor, Scott, Kilgore, Smith, Kuehn, Friederich. NAY's – none. Abstentions – none.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Board was questioning the work being done on the apartments on the corner of 10th Street and South Street. Taylor explained that the existing trailers were removed and that some single apartments will be built. The developer may have received a variance for work on this project and may be approaching the 6-month mark for work to begin. Taylor advised follow up with Mike Bolt to find out if their variance was expiring.

Bob Scott questioned the pros and cons of vacating an alley. No members of the Board were sure of the benefits or disadvantages of vacating an alley. Taylor thought if there were existing sewer lines or utilities running through it, they would have to give an easement and the homeowner would still not be allowed to build on it, so why vacate the alley? The Board thought that the City would want to turn over these alleys to the homeowners and extend their property lines by 10 feet and rid themselves of these unusable properties. Taylor pointed out that all of the old section of town had alleys, where the new section of town had easements placed. There was conversation amongst the Board about various alleys in town and what their purpose served over time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 7:23 p.m. ***Motion passed.*** Passed by unanimous yes voice vote.

