



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2017

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Patrick Duffy
Mike Boyer
John Kolleng
Michael Robke
Christopher Tritsis

Members Absent: Reinhard Schneider
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. 2017-Z-16 419 Prairie Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2017-Z-09 1322 Washington Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. Approval of the March 15, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the March 15, 2017 meeting minutes.

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

V. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 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 Mr. Thomas Pins, architect

3.12 Ms. Theresa Hirsch, applicant
419 Prairie Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 154.45 square foot (3.3%) total floor area variation, a 0.86' side yard setback variation, and a 5.15' garage separation variation to permit the construction of a second-floor addition on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on May 9, 2017.

3.22 The architect wanted to emphasize a few points. The variances are because of the way that the original house was built before the owners owned the house. That limits where they can put the addition. On one side, they are slightly into the setback and they need to minimize that impact. With the design on the second floor, they tried to build it within the roofline. It would keep with the character of the house and would minimize putting on a big roof with an overhang up higher. They were able to keep it down lower and the slope of the roof comes back. It made the square footage of the addition less because they are tucked in. Just going up results in an addition that is larger than allowed. They wanted to minimize the request. The rooms on the second floor are not terribly large.

He referenced the site plan and mentioned that a large part of the addition is fairly centered on the lot. The setbacks on the driveway side are much greater than the required.

He referenced the photo in the packet, which shows the existing house. There is already a second-floor addition that they are taking off and replacing. They are minimizing slightly the impact of one of the corners. They are improving the appearance and lessening any impact on the neighbors.

3.23 Chairman Duffy said he was at the house today and thought that the addition was close to the garage. What would the impact be on the neighbor to the south's light? There is a lot of space between the two houses because the driveway is there. Is this too much house for the lot? There is no alley for separation but there is a decent backyard. The neighbor behind also has a larger backyard. He needed to get comfortable with going over the FAR.

3.24 Mr. Robke asked when the addition in the back was built.

The architect said that it was built around 1968.

The applicant said it was built in 1968 or 1969.

3.25 No one on the Board had additional questions.

3.26 There was no one in the audience to speak on the case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Boyer said that there are three zoning requests for this case. Two of the variances are from existing conditions. One is due to the garage and the distance to the house. The addition will not change the original request granted in 1968. They are building up and there is no additional impact on the house, itself, or the neighbors. The addition is in keeping with the character of the home. They are building within the footprint. The ask is not large for FAR. There is good separation between the houses. The standards of review are met. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Kolleng said he agreed with above comments. The lot is smaller, 50' x 80'. They are not putting too much house on the lot. Two of the variances are pre-existing conditions. They are going with the current footprint. It does not make a lot of sense to require it to go in a little bit more to avoid any kind of FAR request. The FAR request is small. He can support the application.

5.3 Mr. Tritsis said that to the architect's point, the mass is in the center of the lot. He said that the proposal makes sense and he can support it.

5.4 Mr. Robke said he agrees with above comments and that the request is reasonable. Two of the three variation requests are non-issues. He can support the application.

5.5 Chairman Duffy said he can support the request. He looked at whether the request would impact the neighboring properties, but did not find that would happen. They are reducing some of the impact because they are building it into the roofline. He can support this.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Boyer moved to recommend granting a request for a 154.45 square foot (3.3%) total floor area variation, a 0.86' side yard setback variation, and a 5.15' garage separation variation to permit the construction of a second-floor addition on the legal non-conforming structure at 419 Prairie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy Yes

Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Not Present
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 2017-Z-16.

6.21 Mr. Robke 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 particular conditions of the property, the lot size and the location of the house and the garage on the property, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question and not generally shared by others. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a master bedroom and bathroom. The proposed addition is designed with a roofline to match the existing, which also pulls the mass in from the edges of the house, minimizing any impact on the adjacent neighbor. In this way, 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. The addition will not alter the appearance from the street.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 154.45 square foot total floor area variation, a 0.86' side yard setback variation and a 5.15' garage separation variation to permit the construction of a second-floor addition on the legal nonconforming structure at 419 Prairie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing the applicant

3.11 Mr. Nathan Harada, owner
1322 Washington Avenue

3.12 Mr. Eric Gresla, architect

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 109.37 square foot (1.82%) lot coverage variation, a 4.83' front yard setback variation, a 0.91' side yard setback variation, a 4.83' front yard stoop setback variation, a 7.83' front yard step setback variation, a 128.64 square foot (12.37%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 51.94 square foot (4.41%) side yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a rear one-story addition and the reconstruction of an enclosed front entry on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on May 9, 2017.

3.22 The applicant said that they are adding a mudroom, master bedroom and closet and bath. The porch has some structural issues and they are rebuilding. They lived in the house for seven years. When they moved in they had one child and they now have three children. There is the need for more space and amenities. They love their neighborhood and the character of their house, which is one story with a basement.

One of the issues of concern is the need for a mudroom, especially in the winter. They currently enter the door and immediately the children take off their shoes and then enter a small narrow staircase. The mudroom is currently a small landing. The porch slants and is separating from the house so they want to replace it. There is currently one bathroom on the main floor so they want to add a bathroom. There is limited closet space in the master bedroom so they want more space.

Some of the constraints include a narrow lot – 40' wide. The existing placement of the house on the lot is a concern. Financially they could not build up like some neighbors have done. They are adding a small addition to the rear. They met with every neighbor and got signatures on a petition. The neighbors are within a 250' radius of the house.

The architect said they are trying to rebuild the current front porch. The request for the additional front yard setback comes into play because they have to have a true stoop in front of the doorway. Currently steps come right up to the porch. In terms of impervious surface in the front yard, they are not adding. What is there currently exists. The request is minimal in terms of impact.

For the rear addition, the master bedroom is modest in size as shown on the plan. It is about 13' x 13' clear area. They cut out a piece to provide storage for the coats. They want to extend the existing line of the house further back 16'. Regarding the overage on the impervious for the side yard, 38 square feet of that exists. They are adding additional 15 square feet. They are at .9' into the side yard.

The house is unique and is on a narrow lot. The character of the house in the neighborhood is unique and is worth preserving. They are trying to be modest with their requests to provide the applicants with more living space.

- 3.23 Chairman Duffy said what jumped out at him immediately was going over the lot coverage by a little bit. How are they addressing the additional runoff from the additional roof? Does it all go into the yard right now? Will it run off into the sewer? How is this set up?

The applicant said that all downspouts are disconnected from the Village sewer. Beyond the patio is some yard area to absorb water. They are working with the civil engineer who will create a design. They might have a rain garden or impervious pavers. They are aware of the issue.

- 3.24 Chairman Duffy said they are lining up with the neighbor's backyard, the one that runs perpendicular to the property. After an addition, water should not run off onto the neighbor's back yard. There is no alley behind and there is a row of houses that abut one property.

- 3.25 Mr. Boyer referenced the porch and asked if they were rebuilding exactly what was there. Is the stoop causing the variations?

The architect said that the footprint of the porch is the same. The addition for the stairs is the 4' depth of the stoop.

- 3.26 Mr. Boyer said that the new stairs appear to be starting closer to the sidewalk.

Chairman Duffy said that is correct.

- 3.27 Mr. Boyer said that this is a new non-conformity.

- 3.28 Mr. Robke said it is a larger non-conformity because of the requirement for the stoop.

- 3.29 Mr. Robke said that the applicant got a lot of signatures, but not from the adjacent neighbor.

The applicant said that the house is for sale, but the current owners have signed off on the proposal and signed the petition.

- 3.30 Chairman Duffy asked if the neighbor who runs perpendicular signed the petition.
The applicant said it is on the last page of the petition.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Ms. Alexis Hubbard

4.2 Summary of presentations

- 4.21 Ms. Hubbard said they attended the meeting to observe. They also had a question about water run off during rain but that was addressed by the applicant.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Kolleng said when he first saw this his reaction was that they were asking for too much. But he went to look at the site. It is a one-story house in a sea of two story homes. The request is modest regarding additional space. It is a unique structure in the neighborhood. There are a lot of pre-existing conditions. They are extending the porch to make it a safer situation. They are adding a master bedroom and they now will have three bedrooms. They are adding an extra bath and a mudroom. The Board sees residents trying to modify their homes so this request is not unusual. There is limited additional square footage that they are requesting. Standards of review are met. He can support the request. This is the most extensive support he has seen from neighbors and that says a lot.
- 5.2 Mr. Robke said he agrees with the above. His initial reaction was to find justification for all of the requests. There is a lot of lot coverage compared to neighbors. He is somewhat concerned. Standards of review are met and he will support the request.
- 5.3 Mr. Boyer agrees with the above and can support the request.
- 5.4 Chairman Duffy said standards of review are met and he can support the request. His concern was water runoff. The Village engineer will work with them on a plan for this so neighbors should not be impacted.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to recommend granting a request for a 109.37 square foot (1.82%) lot coverage variation, a 4.83' front yard setback variation, a 0.91' side yard setback variation, a 4.83' front yard stoop setback variation, a 7.83' front yard step setback variation, a 128.64 square foot (12.37%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 51.94 square foot (4.41%) side yard impervious surface

coverage variation to permit the construction of a rear one-story addition and the reconstruction of an enclosed front entry on the legal non-conforming structure at 1322 Washington Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

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

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Boyer moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-09.

6.21 Mr. Kolleng 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 conditions of the property, the lot width and the location of the house on the lot, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the lot. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a safe front entry and stairs and with a master bedroom and mudroom. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The rebuilt entry and stairs will improve the appearance of the home.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 109.37 square foot (1.82%) lot coverage variation, a 4.83' front yard setback variation, a 0.91' side yard setback variation, a 4.83' front yard stoop setback variation, a 7.83' front yard step setback variation, a 128.64 square foot (12.37%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 51.94 square foot (4.41%) side yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a rear one-story addition and the reconstruction of an enclosed front entry on the legal non-conforming structure at 1322 Washington Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.