

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
John Wilkolaski, 12993 West Main St.
May 20, 2015 SBL#108.18-3-20

The Zoning Board meeting was called to order by Chairman Mike DeWitt at 6:30 PM.

PRESENT: Chairman DeWitt, Members: Dumke and Kirszenstein, Attorney Trapp, John and Deanna Wilkolaski.

ABSENT: Charles Gaffney and Brian Schumacher

The purpose of this public hearing: request has been made to erect an accessory structure addition 1.40 feet from the side yard line, but Village Code section 210-27D(2) requires a minimum set back of at least 3,000 feet.

At this point Chairman DeWitt opened the Public Hearing to the audience. Mr. Wilkolaski, the applicant explained the reason for his request. Due to the excessive amount of snow, received during the November storm it caused the 12'x24' addition on their 100 year old barn to collapse. They are seeking to replace the addition in it's previous location, but rebuild the roof in a gable construction and the trench poured foundation will be a pole barn foundation. The changes are proposed for structural integrity. Letters of support have been received from all the neighbors with no opposition. Received notification from the county, no comment local matter. Attorney Trapp explained that if they had left up the sides, they would not have been a need for the ZBA meeting. It is more of a technical issue.

MOTION by Tom Kirszenstein, seconded by Robert Dumke, to close the public hearing. Carried

At this time Chairman DeWitt proceeded to review the six criteria for the requested variance.

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the requested area variance? **No**

2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method, feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance? **No, not without making it look funny.**

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial? **No**

4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? **No.**

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created; which consideration shall Be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals, but shall not necessarily

preclude the granting of the area variance? **No. Mother Nature, could be argument either way.**

6. Whether it will create a hazard to health, safety or general welfare?
No, just recreating what they had before.

As all 6 criteria were a no response, the following motion was made:

MOTION by Tom Kirszenstein, seconded by Robert Dumke, to grant requested variance. Unanimous, Carried.

MOTION by Robert Dumke, seconded by Tom Kirszenstein, to adjourn the meeting at 6:38 PM. Carried.

I respectfully submit,



Sue Galbraith, Clerk
Zoning Board of Appeals