



1200 Wilmette Avenue  
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

**MEETING MINUTES**

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2016**

**7:30 P.M.**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

---

**Members Present:** Chairman Patrick Duffy  
John Kolleng  
Reinhard Schneider

**Members Absent:** Mike Boyer  
Michael Robke  
Bob Surman

**Staff Present:** Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Duffy called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

**II. 2016-Z-48 1132 Michigan Avenue**

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

**III. 2015-Z-44 3533 Illinois Road**

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

**IV. 2016-Z-41 1810 Elmwood Avenue**

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

**V. Approval of the September 21, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the September 21, 2016 meeting minutes.

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

**VI. Approval of the October 5, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the October 5, 2016 meeting minutes.

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

**VII. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts  
Assistant Director of Community Development

**3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS, AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

**3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 None

**3.2 Summary of presentations**

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that the applicant was not able to attend the November 9, 2016 meeting and had requested that the case be continued to November 16, 2016.

**6.0 DECISION**

6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to continue the case to the November 16, 2016 meeting.

6.11 Mr. Schneider seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

**3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS, AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

**3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 None

**3.2 Summary of presentations**

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that the applicant was not able to attend the November 9, 2016 meeting and had requested that the case be continued to December 7, 2016.

**6.0 DECISION**

6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to continue the case to the December 7, 2016 meeting.

6.11 Mr. Schneider seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

### **3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

#### **3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 Mr. Sean Traci, applicant

3.12 Ms. Dana Traci, applicant

#### **3.2 Summary of presentations**

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a revised request for an 8.55' front yard porch setback variation, a 6.55' front yard porch step setback variation, a 292.88 square foot (23.43%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 66.31 square foot (5.3%) [editing note: this was later corrected] front porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a front porch on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on November 22, 2016.

3.22 Chairman Duffy explained that the case was remanded back to the Zoning Board. He gave some information about the case to bring all Board members up to speed. The applicants came to the Board a few weeks ago requesting a wrap around porch. It was not approved. They went to the Village Board with an altered plan. The applicants took off the western section and the Village Board said that they were not sure if the ZBA would support this change so the case came back to the Zoning Board.

It was his opinion at the last meeting that if they took off the west section, he could live with this because the house is sited far forward on the lot. It is an original house on the block. They are already in the front yard setback. Is that the only change made to the porch?

Mr. Traci said that was the only change made. He showed a photograph of the existing house. There is a side entrance. He showed the original wrap around porch design. When Chairman Duffy suggested cutting off the western side at the previous meeting, Mr. Traci was not sure what the Chairman was suggesting. He did not understand what the word, hardship, meant at a zoning meeting. He said that he and his wife are happy with the new proposed plan.

They have an overhead shot that shows the neighbors to the east who have porches that are 6' away from the sidewalk and another is 10' away from the sidewalk. His porch will be 12.5' away from the sidewalk.

He said that Chairman Duffy asked what the neighbors thought about the proposal and he was not ready for that question. After the meeting they got signatures from immediate neighbors supporting the plan as proposed.

3.23 Mr. Tritsis said he appreciated hearing the case overview. He said that it was nice that the applicants took Board recommendations into account and incorporated them into the plan. He asked about a step on the side and if there was a stair.

Mr. Traci said that there will be a stair on the side. He explained where the step would be.

3.24 Chairman Duffy said that 1.17 showed the step on the side and in the front. It is off the edge of the label Z on the plans.

3.25 Mr. Tritsis said that another document had not labeled step on the side even though it was drawn as a step.

3.26 Mr. Schneider asked by how much they reduced the front yard coverage variation.

Mr. Traci said it was reduced by about 50 square feet. Last time it was 100 square feet.

Ms. Traci said this is noted in the comments.

3.27 Mr. Schneider said that the original proposal talked about 147 square foot front porch coverage variation. This one is 66 square feet. Did they reduce this by 80 square feet?

Mr. Traci said that 80 square feet is correct.

3.28 Mr. Schneider referenced 1.6. It is 11'8" x 4'4", which is about 50 square feet. How do they go from 147 square feet to 66 square feet?

Ms. Traci said they are cutting off the west side wrap around.

3.29 Mr. Schneider said he understood that part. He is trying to figure out how they went from 147 to 66 square feet.

Ms. Traci said that there is a cut on the east side and a cut on the west side.

Mr. Traci explained that they were also reducing the east side by more than 1'.

3.30 Chairman Duffy said that 1.6 is the old proposal showing the wrap around.

3.31 Mr. Schneider said that 1.12 is the new proposal that shows the same width.

Mr. Traci said that their architect is not at tonight's meeting and he is not sure where he is.

There was discussion about the proposed changes.

Mr. Traci clarified that Mr. Schneider said that the change is not 80 square feet.

Ms. Roberts said that was correct.

- 3.32 Ms. Roberts asked if a 51 square foot reduction sounded better. She did not disagree with the architect's numbers. She may have put the wrong numbers in the report.
- 3.33 Mr. Schneider said that the original is 146.84 square feet and the reduction is 51 square feet so it would be more like a 95 square feet variance request.
- 3.34 Chairman Duffy said that the correct number is 95.77 square feet for the variance.
- 3.35 Mr. Kolleng said that the impervious surface coverage request is correct.
- 3.36 Chairman Duffy said that the hardship has not changed, which is the siting of the house on the lot.
- 3.37 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case. There was no additional communication on this case.

## **5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

- 5.1 Mr. Kolleng said that the Board had suggested at the last hearing that if the west side came off this would be something they could support. At that time, the applicants did not want to make changes. Now they are returning with changes. He can support the request. What they are trying to do makes sense. It creates larger variations than the Board usually sees, but given where the house is sited and how far from the street they are, it creates a lot of the variations.
- 5.2 Mr. Schneider agreed with the above and can support the request.
- 5.3 Mr. Tritsis said he agreed and the proposed porch will be a positive for their block.
- 5.4 Chairman Duffy said that the Board applauded the applicants' efforts to modify the house and improve its curb appeal. The porch will be just as functional as it was in the original proposal. The porch is beautiful.

## **6.0 DECISION**

- 6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to recommend granting a revised request for an 8.55' front yard porch setback variation, a 6.55' front yard porch step setback variation, a 292.88 square foot (23.43%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 96.31 square foot (7.7%) front porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a front porch on the legal non-conforming structure at 1810 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans as revised.

[Editing note: these are the corrected variation numbers.]

6.11 Mr. Schneider seconded the motion and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Not Present
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Christopher Tritsis	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Kolleng moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2016-Z-41.

6.21 Mr. Schneider seconded the motion and 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 physical condition of the property, the location of the house on the lot, imposes upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owners was not created by the owners and is due to the unique circumstances of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a relocated front door and new porch to provide shelter to the door and to improve the appearance of the home. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties or otherwise injure other properties. The variations, if granted, will add to the essential character of the neighborhood, where front porches are common.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a revised request for an 8.55’ front yard porch setback variation, a 6.55’ front yard porch step setback variation, a 292.88 square foot (23.43%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 96.31 square foot (7.7%) front porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a front porch on the legal non-conforming structure at 1810 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans as revised.