



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2014

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Dan Sullivan
Mike Boyer
Patrick Duffy
Reinhard Schneider
Bob Surman

Members Absent: John Kolleng
Lynn Norman

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:29 p.m.

II. 2014-Z-35 122 Dupee Place

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. Approval of the June 18, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Boyer moved to approve the June 18, 2014 meeting minutes.

Mr. Duffy seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.

IV. Approval of the July 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Duffy moved to approve the July 2, 2014 meeting minutes.

Mr. Surman seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANTS

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Chad Boomgaarden, architect
1315 Central Avenue

3.12 Mr. Chris Plampin, owner
122 Dupee Place

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 3.44' minimum side yard setback and a 0.74' side yard porch setback variation to permit the construction of a front porch addition and a second floor addition on a legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on August 26, 2014.

3.22 The architect showed a photo of what the addition would look like. He also showed the site plan, indicating the setback line and where the house is currently non-conforming. They want to add a second floor. Currently the roofline ends right at the top of the first floor line. By going up, they are requesting to locate within the side yard setback for the length of the existing wall. They are asking for a variance for the front porch to square off the corner above the porch stairs, to add a support column for the addition. That is the 0.7 front porch addition.

3.23 Mr. Schneider asked if the architect was showing the south elevation and if that was the same as the information included in the packet.

The architect said that the design is not what was in the packet, but the setbacks are what as in the packet. They added a double instead of the single gable that is shown in the packet.

3.24 Mr. Surman clarified that the front porch remains the same.

The architect said that the coverage, the outline, the footprint, and the variance request is the same. The styling on the upper floor has changed.

3.25 Mr. Plampin said they have lived in the Village for nine years. They have wanted to do this addition for nine years and they are now able to. The existing house is 1.5 stories. The second floor is not very usable. There is one existing gable for his son's bedroom. They have wanted to add a true second floor. They have an elderly relative living with them. The whole project is part of improvements to the house.

3.26 Mr. Schneider asked the current and proposed heights.

The architect said that it is 28'3" to the top of the ridge currently and the proposed is from 28' to 34'. It depends on how the roof line is accentuated, that will determine the height.

- 3.27 Mr. Surman said they are not asking for a variance on that portion of the proposed plans. Are they in the process of refining the design?

The architect said that they are in the process of refining the roofline.

- 3.28 Mr. Surman clarified that the portion they are seeking a variance on is not changing.

The architect said that was correct.

- 3.29 Mr. Schneider said he is looking at standards of review and to what extent the higher south elevation will impact light and air to neighbors to the south.

The architect said that in anticipation of that question, he took some photos in the neighborhood showing houses above the 28'3" height. The roofline is in question due to what the house will look like. Will they go more English Tudor? More of a beach cottage? He showed rooflines that were much higher a block away from this house (to the east) and others that were higher to the north of this house. They are adding a double gable to add interest. They are trying to incorporate the front bay without building up straight as a two-story mass by having it slope back to the second floor addition. Then there will be a setback to the second floor.

Instead of having the main gable run continuously back, they decided to clip the gables and make a shed roof in between the two gables to minimize the impact to the neighbors to the south.

- 3.30 Mr. Schneider asked if anyone spoke with the neighbors to the south.

The owner said that the neighbor to the south is present to testify or to answer questions.

- 3.31 Chairman Sullivan asked what it would look like if the request was not approved. What would they do?

The architect said they would still need a variance because he is touching the exterior wall.

- 3.32 Chairman Sullivan said they would still have to go back. They would not necessarily square it off.

The architect said he would have to bring the addition back to the interior bearing wall. If he cannot touch anything within a specific edge, he would have to create a second bearing wall. At that point, it might not be worth doing the project at all. It

is a unique situation because the lot is close to the lot line. The Sanborn map shows similar homes in the area.

- 3.33 Mr. Duffy said that the architect said that the hardship he is experiencing, the reason why he asking for the variance, is the siting of the house on the lot because they are too close to the lot line.

The architect said that there are several examples where they have gone above 28'3", which exists. They started with that dimension and the existing roof line. There is some fluctuation as to how high it would go to create an 8' flat ceiling on the second floor. Depending on roofline, he does not know the final dimension.

The owner said they will not have an attic that has livable space.

- 3.34 There was no communication on this case.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

4.11 Mr. Bruce Kenamore
120 Dupee Place

4.2 Summary of presentations

- 4.21 Mr. Kenamore said he and wife live adjacent to this home. They looked at the plans and talked with the architect and have no problem with the submittal.
- 4.22 Mr. Boyer said that Mr. Kenamore is the neighbor who is most directly impacted and he has no problem with the request. Mr. Kenamore said the houses are close together and that won't change.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Duffy said he believes that this is a straightforward case. The house was built prior to the current ordinance and was built close to the lot line. Whatever work they will do to create a second floor seems like it will touch the wall and they would need a variance. The neighbor to the south supports the request and he is the most directly impacted. Mr. Duffy said he has no qualms supporting this because the standards of review are met.
- 5.2 Mr. Boyer said that all standards of review are met. They are asking for a minimum request for the addition. There is a lot more they could do on the lot. It is a good addition and the design is sympathetic to the neighborhood. He can support the application.

- 5.3 Mr. Surman agreed and said that he can support the request.
- 5.4 Mr. Schneider said he would support the request. He was initially concerned about the neighbor to the south having concerns, but that is not the case. To move to comply with the current setback requirements for the second floor would be prohibitive and a hardship.
- 5.5 Chairman Sullivan agreed and Mr. Boyer pointed out that what they are doing is the minimum. They did a good job minimizing the variation. The addition will fit with the character of the neighborhood.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Duffy moved to recommend granting a request for a 3.44' minimum side yard setback and a 0.74' side yard porch setback variation to permit the construction of a front porch addition and a second floor addition on a legal non-conforming structure at 122 Dupee Place in accordance with the plans submitted.

- 6.11 Mr. Boyer seconded the motion and the vote was all ayes and no nays (Ms. Norman and Mr. Kolleng were not present).

Motion carried.

- 6.2 Mr. Duffy move to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2014-Z-35.

- 6.21 Mr. Boyer seconded the motion. The voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The particular physical conditions of the property, the siting of the house close to the south lot line, impose upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique development of the lot. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question. The hardship prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a second-story addition in line with the existing first floor. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, which includes two-story homes.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 3.44' minimum side yard setback and a 0.74' side yard porch setback variation to permit the construction of a

front porch addition and a second floor addition on a legal non-conforming structure at 122 Dupee Place in accordance with the plans submitted.